ROADS TO FREEDOM & SLAVERY

By

RATISH MOHAN AGARWALA,

M.A., LL.B.

PUBLISHED BY

GARGA BOOK DEPOT

89, Chah Maimmaran Street,

MEERUT.

Re. 1 As. 8. } 1924. { 2$ Net.

ROADS TO
FREEDOM & SLAVERY

Printed by Lala Ram Nath, Published by Matru Lal Garga,
AT THE BHASKAR PRESS MEERUT.

CONTENTS.

PART I.

SOCIALISM.

PART II.

BOLSHEVISM AND SYNDICALISM.

PREFACE.

This book has been written in order to give the reader a comprehensive idea of the various schemes of social reconstruction that now confront us, and which we are required to adopt if we are to attain happiness, and freedom. Of course, the presumption is made that our present social system, whatever it is, is rotten and deserves to be overthrown. Its opponents give it the name of "Capitalism"—by which they mean the era of machine industry, in which the agents of production are owned by private individuals, and production is carried on, on a competitive basis. The evils to which Capitalism has led are many and various. It has created a great difference in the amount of wealth owned by different individuals, has created on the one hand a class of rich men who do nothing than merely "reap where they have not sown", and "live a life of ease and idleness" and a class of men, who "live on the sweat of their brow" and toil from day to night on the other All that the latter get in return is a week's wage which is hardly enough to support them

or their family. Even that becomes impossible in "slack" seasons and in times of crises when the labourers are thrown out of employment and made "to walk the streets or sit at home". Besides the above, Capitalism is said to have created many more evils that afflict society at present. It has promoted warfare between nations, has led to the exploitation of the weaker races by the strong, of the weaker men by the stronger ones of the same race or tribe and has created a class-war between exploiting Bourgeoisie and the exploited Proletariats.

All this sounds uncongenial to the social reformer. He is fully convinced that Capitalism must go, and he is fully prepared to prefer "even Anarchy" to the present system. Various proposals are consequently made to serve as rival schemes of social re-organization. The Communists, the Anarchists, the Collectivists, the Syndicalists and the Guild Socialists have each one of them something or the other to say and they all claim a hearance from us as our Saviours. We are told that the present Capitalist system is one of "slavery"—of "wage-slavery"—and that all the other schemes that are presented to us are the various "Roads to Freedom". An attempt

is, moreover, made to out-Marx Marx and to show not only that Capitalism will fall, but also that it will be succeeded by "Socialism", which would be itself followed by Communism, and that again by Anarchism, which is said to be the highest stage of human development, and the ultimate ideal towards which society must continually approach. Socialism—by which is meant here "Collectivism" —, Communism, and Anarchism are thus not even the different "Roads to Freedom" but *the various stages* on the "*Road to Freedom*".

That is, in short, the sum and substance of the eminent scholar, Professor Bertrand Russell's now well-know work "Roads to Freedom" which has won for itself a permanent place in the literature of Socialism. The book deals with the different theories as we have enumerated them above in a manner worthy of the great professor himself. His frankness, candidness, and sincerity are beyond question and no man can safely dare to question his erudition.

With all due deference to the great professor, however, I have to submit that if *one* name was necessary to describe these various theories, it was not "Roads to Freedom" but rather "Roads

to Freedom and Slavery," as I have named this book. A man must have a very poor idea of the *present social system* in order to be able to identify it with "Slavery" pure and simple, and to regard every scheme opposed to it as a "Road to Freedom".

Men living in the heat and the turmoil of a modern highly industrialised country of Europe might not be able to judge things calmly and might be lead to adopt desperate measures for the abolition of Capitalism, but it is simply disgusting to an Asiatic—barring perhaps a Japanese—to talk of the present social system as something monstrous, and as deserving of destruction at the earliest possible moment, being replaced thereafter by any of the rival schemes of Social reconstruction which now hold the field. We in India, for instance, do not feel we have any very great problems of Capitalism to solve, and we donot know if it would be wise on the part of any man to advise the bringing of a Social Revolution in India at present. The present social system in India is *not* rotten, *not* going down to pieces, and *no* amount of jugglary can persuade her people to exchange it for Communism or Anarchism !

What is, then, the difference, if any, between

the *present Social Systems* in India and Europe respectively? Is it the use of machines or the prevalence of competition? Is it the problem of Capital and Labour? And last but not least, is it the institution of private property and the private ownership of the agents of production that differentiates the two systems? None of these seems to be the real points of difference. What is, then, the present system *of the world* in which there is Laissez Faire on the one hand, and state regulation on the other? What are in short the essentials of the present system?

The answer to the above is simple enough. The present social system is *not Capitalism, but Individualism*, which is at present prevalent throughout the civilised world. What is then Capitalism? I regard it only as *the existence of excessive and unjustified inequalities that exist at present* in some of the more "industrialised" countries of Europe. I call it a *disease* which now afflicts the Individualist system, and the problem that now confronts the countries of Europe and America is—how to cure that disease and put an end to Capitalism, and for countries that are less industrialised or are just now beginning to get industrialised—how to prevent society from falling a victim to the same fell disease?

My solution of the problem I have embodied in the following few pages.

I have begun by pointing out the fourfold aspect of a man's life—moral, religious, social and physical. I regard it as the aim of every social system, that would claim perfection, to develop all these different aspects of human life. The question then arises not whether there ought to be any private property or not, whether production should be carried on for profit or for use, but whether that fourfold aspect of a man's life can be developed by giving him full liberty of action or by making him a slave of somebody or of society as a whole. I hold, personally, that a man's moral, religious, and social beings can be developed only by giving him "liberty". It would be futile on the part of society to try to dictate terms to its members in these matters. But the fourth—the physical aspect of his life—stands on a different footing. All wealth is a *social* commodity. It is the product of social organization and a man has no justification to think that his riches concern him alone and nobody else. Society has, therefore, the right to organise the production and the distribution of wealth, in a way that might be most conductive

to the social interests. *But society has no right to organise production and distribution in a way that may interfere with the moral, religious and the social "liberties" of individuals. Freedom* of consumption and production are necessary, for the proper development of a man higher qualities. What then of the right of society to organise the production and the distribution of wealth, in a way most conductive to social welfare? That right we give to society, *but then the burden of proving that any particular restriction is so necessary lies upon it.* That being done, there seems to be nothing left in the way of providing an ideal social system. I hold, therefore, that Individualism *which aims at giving the individual the greatest possible liberty consistent with the social interests,* is the *ideal* system, which must be retained at all costs. Anarchism is "licen-se" and Communism "slavery," and cannot there-fore, claim any preference over Individualism.

Individualism is however suffering at present from the fell disease of Capitalism which means for me *an excessive inequality in the distribution of wealth of a nation.* There are various propo-sals for curing that disease. Those various sche-mes do not lead towards the same way. Some

lead to Slavery, others to Freedom. I hold that Liberal Socialism as I have described it below is the only "Road to Freedom," all the rest being "Roads to Slavery."

I need not anticipate here the many controversies that have arisen in the body of the present work. I further claim no finality for my views as expressed here, and would be most glad to revise them in the next edition of this work, if I am convinced of their mistake. The first four chapters of this work on "Liberal Socialism" deserve the special indulgence of my readers as I have written them before I can safely lay claim to write anything original. It was my ambition to create a new theory of Socialism on the three famous propositions of Prof. A. C. Pigou, after a few more years' study and research work. To wait for so long a time was, however, found almost impossible for me and I have consequently sketched out the main conclusions on which I have arrived yet, in this very book. I hope the readers and the eminent scholars who might deign to go through it would help me with their kind suggestions for its further development.

In the end I have to thank Prof. Nand Lal

Bhatnagar Esq. M. A. of Meerut College Meerut for his kindly supplying me with books from the college library, and for the keen interest he has been taking throughout in the progress of my book. I have similiarly to thank Prof. S.K. Rudra Esq. M. A. of the Allahabad University.

A list of books has been given in the end, for further study if required.

RATISH MOHAN AGARWALA

MEERUT

20th Sep. 1924.

Part I.

SOCIALISM

Liberal and Scientific.

"Individual character, energy and inventiveness are the mainspring of human progress".—PROF. RAMSAY MUIR.

"The progress of humanity must depend in the future, as in the past, upon the improvement of the individual man".—SIR ARTHUR CLAY.

"It is better for a man to go wrong in freedom than to go right in chains".—PROF. T. H HUXLEY.

"To give the freest possible vent to every healthy form of enterprise; to create such condition of work that every man, in every grade of industry, will feel impelled to work his hardest; to diffuse as widely as possible the habits of thrift...........these are the only ways in which a society placed as ours is to-day can hope to extricate it-self from its difficulties."—PROF. RAMSAY MUIR.

Liberal Socialism

CHAPTER I.

The Evolution of Modern Individualism.

The question as to what should be the mutual relations between the individual and the society has been the most perplexing one for the Sociologists of all times to answer. And the perplexity is all the more enhanced by the fact that man is neither wholly an individual, nor is he wholly a social being. Truly speaking, he has four distinct aspects of his life which must be distinguished one from the other and must all receive an equal attention if man is to realise the highest mission of his life.

In the first place, man is a *moral* being, who must try to form his *character* and acquire for himself a *personality*, He must learn to feel *respect for his own self* and *love for his human kind*. He must moreover learn to be *mentally free*, to refuse to sacrifice his higher being for merely worldly gains and above all to be *honest*, *truthful and virtuous* in his dealings with other men.

Secondly, man is a *social* being, a subject of *social rights and duties*. In this capacity he can

demand certain rights at the hands of other men and must observe certain duties towards them. As a child, he has a claim upon his fellow-men for a proper nourishment and after a time for a decent education and training for his after-life. As a man, he has the duty of not interfering unduly with the liberty of others and of submitting to the organised will of society whenever deemed necessary and in so far as he can safely do so without belieing his manhood.

In the third place, man is a *religious* being, trying to realise his God, to elevate his soul, and to attain salvation.

And last but not least, man is a *physical* being, who must *live* before he can do anything else. He must *eat and drink*, must *enjoy* himself as best he can, must satisfy his *animal passions* and must *protect himself* from excessive heat and cold, from rain and the thunder-storm.

Any social system, therefore, if it has to be called perfect, must deal with man from all the above points of view. It must adjust the mutual relations of men so as to enable every one of them to raise himself morally, socially and religiously and must at the same time provide

them all with as many things that would satisfy his physical wants as might enable him to live decently. In order that it might be so, it must be decided as to whether men should be wholly left to themselves, without any restrictions from society whatsoever, or whether society should wholly enslave them, and dictate to them what they shall do and what they shall not do, and lastly whether it should steer a middle course and give them the greatest possible liberty, only restraining them whereever found necessary in the social interests. It must, in short, choose between "Anarchism", which annhilates the society altogether, "Communism" which annhilates the individual altogether and "Individualism" which tries to preserve them both, to exalt the individual and to protect the society aswell. These are the *only three possible social systems* from the point of view of "liberty", And the war between 'liberty' and 'slavery' is being fought since the begining of creation, and is as old as the world itself. We have no records as to when man was first created, but so far as our human minds can probe into the dark and dream of things as they must have been in the beginning of creation we might hazard the view that there then was *no society* whatsoever, and men were free to roam about the world like wild beasts

without any 'let or hinderance,' knowing nothing of a corporate life or of social bonds —there was, then, in short, a state "*Anarchism*", perfect beyond the dreams of the most invincible Bakunin, or a Kropotkine, William Morris or a Bertrand Russell. There was then, in other words, not a 'government of men' but an "administration of things". There were no capitalists, or labourers and no class "distinctions" or "contradictions." There was moreover no "competitive industry," no "self-interest" to make men "immoral". Men were under no compulsion "to produce" and were free to partake of the "common pleasures of the world"—the berries and the leaves of trees—according to their "needs". That was, in short, the social system which "God" had handed over to man when He first created the world, and that the system which some of the most brilliant scholars of our time would fain see re-established here !

That early system of unlicensed individual liberty was, however, found impossible to last for long—we leave it to the Anarchist philosophers of the present times to analyse the causes of the failure of their favourite system in those early times, and to show how they would prevent the same from again coming into operation, if Anarchism were once

more established in this world, and destroying it —and we next find society established on a more or less Communistic basis.

The social pendulem had somehow or the other taken a swing to the other extreme and we find a social system in which the individual is wholly repressed—politically, economically, religiously and even morally. The family is, in the very first place, the supreme authority over the members thereof, the "Patria Potestas" or the father of the family, determining as to what its members were to do, what they were to consume, read or talk. The individual had no rights as against the family, and had to submit to the will of its head in all matters. The family itself was wholly at the mercy of the caste, or the tribe and had to submit to the decrees of its leader. The family and the caste were not to be a kind of "Mutual Welfare Societies" but a sort of "Compulsory Labour Bereaus," dictating to their members what profession they were to follow, what things they were to produce, and what share of the whole produce were each of them to receive. All property belonged to the faimly, the caste or the commune. In the political sphere also we find the "King" who is virtually an autocrat, whose will is law and at whose hands *no* rights

of individuals are safe. Below him there is a long chain of masters and servants and a social heirarchy extending from the King to the humblest of the serfs. The individual had, in short, become the slave of others not only economically and politically, but also morally, spiritually, and religiously.

This reign of authority and compulsion also could not, however, last for long. Men began to feel that in order to be able to do something, they must regain their freedom. They began to realise their true self and to pine for the good old days of simple "Anarchism". The social pendulem, therefore, again took a swing backwards, till it found a happy mean and society established itself upon an *Individualistic* basis, *which tries to give the individual the greatest possible liberty,—political, economic, social, religious, personal and domestic—, society only reserving to itself the right of restraining that liberty and of regulating those individuals wherever found necessary to do so in the social interests.* Thus was established the reign of "liberty" in this world after the latter had successively passed through various stages of "license" and "slavery". Anarchism and Communism had discredited themselves for good and Individualism has now been securely established in

almost all the civilized countries of the world as the best of all the three possible social systems. We propose to study in the next chapter the essentials of Individualism and the problems that now threaten its existence as a result of its being hitherto identified with a wrong philosophy.

CHAPTER II.

Individualism and Laissez Faire.

We have observed in the previous chapter that the social system which was found to be the most suitable one from the point of view of both the individual and the society was that of "Individualism" which tries to give the individual the greatest possible liberty consistent with the social interests. The task of gaurding the "social interests" was assigned to the "state," which was a sufficiently difficult thing in it self, difficulty being the further increased by the fact that the age of autocracy had passed away and men refused to be regulated by their rulers arbitrarily, but only according to fixed laws. Where was thenthe jurist who would make laws that would exactly determine the proper

of individuals are safe. Below him there is a long chain of masters and servants and a social heirarchy extending from the King to the humblest of the serfs. The individual had, in short, become the slave of others not only economically and politically, but also morally, spiritually, and religiously.

This reign of authority and compulsion also could not, however, last for long. Men began to feel that in order to be able to do something, they must regain their freedom. They began to realise their true self and to pine for the good old days of simple "Anarchism". The social pendulem, therefore, again took a swing backwards, till it found a happy mean and society established itself upon an *Individualistic* basis, *which tries to give the individual the greatest possible liberty,—political, economic, social, religious, personal and domestic—, society only reserving to itself the right of restraining that liberty and of regulating those individuals wherever found necessary to do so in the social interests.* Thus was established the reign of "liberty" in this world after the latter had successively passed through various stages of "license" and "slavery". Anarchism and Communism had discredited themselves for good and Individualism has now been securely established in

almost all the civilized countries of the world as the best of all the three possible social systems. We propose to study in the next chapter the essentials of Individualism and the problems that now threaten its existence as a result of its being hitherto identified with a wrong philosophy.

CHAPTER II.

Individualism and Laissez Faire.

We have observed in the previous chapter that the social system which was found to be the most suitable one from the point of view of both the individual and the society was that of "Individualism" which tries to give the individual the greatest possible liberty consistent with the social interests. The task of gaurding the "social interests" was assigned to the "state," which was a sufficiently difficult thing in it self, difficulty being the further increased by the fact that the age of autocracy had passed away and men refused to be regulated by their rulers arbitrarily, but only according to fixed laws. Where was thenthe jurist who would make laws that would exactly determine the proper

limits of state control and where the economist that would suggest the most proper device for increasing the sum total of human happiness without unduly encroaching upon the liberty of individuals? How could, in short, the state be prevented from becoming wholly anarchistic and annhilating itself by giving to the individuals a general charter to do anything they liked, or from going to the extent of unduly trampling the rights of individuals underneath in the supposed interests of society? The latter danger was found to be the more serious one and failing a proper scheme for realising the Individualist ideal, the political philosopher prefered to let the state be anarchistic rather than communistic. The doctrine of Laissez Faire i.e. of leaving things alone, was thus suggested by him as the best policy for the state to follow in all matters. The state was only to gaurd society against foreign attack and internal dissensions, to protect the life and property of the individuals, to impart justice and "to erect and maintain certain public works and institutions which it can never be in the interests of individuals to erect or maintain". Beyond these clear cut limits the state was never to go, if it was not to annhilate itself or at least to land itself in all sorts of difficulties.

The advocates of Laissez Faire further declared that it enabled men to think out things for themselves, to consume and to produce whatever they liked. They moreover tried to show that in case the state undertook to give the individual *exclusive control* over what he produced i.e. in case the state recognised rights of private property, it would not only have enabled the individual to have *confidence in himself*, and learn to be a bit more *responsible* by being called upon to "administer his resources" properly, but would also be equally advantageous for society by enabling the individual to apply himself to the production of those things for which he was most fitted.

Laissez Faire was thus found to be the philosophy that was equally to satisfy the claims of liberty, utility, individuality and productivity and was thus eagerly taken to by most of the advanced countries of the world till at last it created a disease—the disease of Capitalism—in the Individualist body, which has now been so far advanced as to threaten its very existence and which has given a chance to the Anarchists and the Communists, whom we thought to be for ever vanquished to once more raise their heads from

out their graves, to point out to us the folly of Individualism to make a plea for once more restoring Anarchism and Communism to their former greatness and thereby to make a hell of what were a heaven *if only we could cure the disease of Capitalism from which Individualism is suffering and make sufficient safegaurds against its once more falling a victim to the same at a later date.* If we are not to conspire with the enemies of Individualism, therefore, we must set ourselves seriously to the task of making an accurate diagnosis of that disease and to find the most effective remedy for its cure. We propose to devote a seperate chapter to that subject.

CHAPTER III.

The Problem of Capitalism.

Professor A. C. Pegou of the Cambridge University lays down the three following propositions in connection with his masterly study of the Economics of Welfare:—Firstly, "*Any cause which without the exercise of compulsion or pressure upon people to make them work more than their vishes and interests dictate, inceases productive effeciency and therewith, the average volume of*

the National dividend, provided that it neither injures the distribution nor augments the variability of the country's consumable income, will, in general, increase economic welfare", secondly, "*Any cause which increases the proportion of the national Dividend received by poor persons, provided that it does not lead* to *a contraction of the Dividend, and does not injureouly affect its variability, will in general, increase economic welfare"*, and lastly "*Any cause which diminishes the variability of the Nationald Dividend, provided that it neither diminishes its volume nor injures its distribution, will in general increase economic welfare"*.

It follows from the above that the economic welfare of a nation depends on, the average volume, the distribution, and the variability of the National Dividead. That economic welfare should depend upon the volume of the National Dividend is evident enough, but, it requires some more words to explain how it depends also on the distribution and the variability of the National Dividend. We will deal with each of these two seperately.

Firstly, economic welfare increases, *all other things remaining the same*, the greater the *equality* in the distribution of a country's wealth. And

that from two different points of view. Firstly. supposing the different inhabitants of a country to have the same mental constitutions and temperaments, it may be maintained that a given sum of money can be used to satisfy more intense wants if it is left with a poor man than when it is left with a rich one. Even supposing them to have different temperaments, as is actually the case at present, it may be doubted whether the difference is not much more artificial than natural and whether the so-called poor could not by better training learn to have higher wants than at present. From the hedonic point of view, therefore, a more equal distribution of a nation's wealth creates more *happiness* than would otherwise have been the case. A more equal distribution therefore increases the sum total of social welfare.

Secondly, inequalities in distribution are undesirable from another and a more important point of view. The *fact of inequality* naturally results in creating a greater breach between what Prof. Pigou calls the "satisfaction" and the "desires". The marginal utility of money to the rich man being less than what it is to the poor man, he can offer more for the purchase of a commodity or a service, which has

the same utility for him as it has for the poor. The "demand" that matters in the market is the "*effective* demand" and what makes a demand effective is not the intensity with which it is felt but the amount of money that is offered in lieu thereof. The rich and the poor both go therefore into the market with unequal weapons and the rich man is able to carry the day simply because he has more money and can easily offer two pounds to buy the same sort or the same amount of satisfaction for which the poor man could spare only a pound. The rich are, therefore, able to attract the labourers to produce articles of luxury, for them while the poor have actually to starve, because they cannot pay more to those very labourers to produce *bread* for them. Similiarly with the entrepreneurs and the managers of industry. They produce things for which there is the *greatest demand* in the market, the demand being *not the actual*, but the *effective* one. Where is then the Capitalist defence to the indictment of the Socialist that at present production is for "profit" rather than for "use," and where the defence of the rich when the poor demand the putting to an end of a cause which at present enables the former to take away a morsel of bread from off the mouth of the latter and to

offer it instead to his dogs, not because his dog requires it more, but simply because he has more money and does not care to spend it in furtherance of social ends but only in anti-social ones? Let not any man then declare that the riches of a man concern him alone, and that society, has no right to take them away from him *in so for* as it deems it necessary to do so in the social interests!

Then we shall deal briefly with Prof. Pigous third proposition, that economic welfare depends on the variability of the National Dividend, and that it increases or decreases according as the variability of the National Dividend is great or small. The reason is that if the dividend does not vary much from year to year the marginal utility of the dividend itself is equalised over a number of years and thus enables it to be better utilised than would otherwise have been the case. And as a corollary of the above, economic welfare suffers much more when the income of the poor becomes variable, than it does when that of the rich becomes so. Prof. Pigou even maintains that economic welfare is increased, all other things being equal, whenever any cause "diminishes

the variability of the part of the national accruing to the poor", even though it "increases in a corresponding measure the variability of the part accruing to the rich".

These are, in short, the three famous propositions of Prof. Pigou They would thus have made it abundantly clear that 'Laissez Faire' was an utterly unsound policy for the state to adopt in order to realise a perfect Individualism. Its advocates mainly prided themselves upon its capacity to give free vent to the 'self-interest' of men, which would lead them to produce the largest amount of wealth, upon which *alone* they thought, human welfare depended. *They took no account of the "equality" of distribution or of the "variability" of a man's income.*

The above omission did not, however, create any very great difficulties till production was carried on, on a small scale in the cottages and the homes of the producers themselves, and has not created any very great difficulties even now in countries where it is yet so carried on. But the case was otherwise in countries where as a result of the Industrial revolution, "machines" were adopted for the purposes of production.

Here was a new problem facing the Laissez Faire philosopher ! "Machine Industry" was exceptionally well suited for increasing the production of material goods, but was equally defective from the point of view of bringing about an equal distribution, or of making the volume of the National Dividend less variable Instead, it actually *increased the ineqality* and made the Dividend *more variable* by an occasional recurrence of periods of boom and depressions, by leading to overproductions and underproductions, to plenty, and crises !

Laissez Faire still ! Inequalities once having set in, and society not restraining them in any way, they tended to increase till at last they have attained present dimensions, have created Rockfellers, De Morgans and Rothschilds on the one hand and a "reserve army" of the permanently unemployed Proletariats, who "have nothing to lose but their chains", on the other.

These inequalities which are mostly unjustifiable, led to many social evils and tyrannies. They not only took labour and capital away from producing articles of "necessity" for the poor, to produce those of "luxury" for the rich, but also created a new difficulty by enabling the

rich to buy "lands" and erect factories freely, till at last these articles, having an extremely inelastic demand for productive purposes, the owners thereof began to yield exceptional powers. Monopolies and trusts began to be formed which while they were a benefit from the productive point of view, in much as they enabled the advantages of large scale production to be realised, were a curse in so far as they increased the inequality in the distribution of wealth by enabling the capitalists to *exploit* the labourers and the consumers. They were thereby enabled to dictate their own terms to these last two, which the latter had to accept as there was no other alternative open to them.

This is in short the problem of modern Capitalism, which is *not a system, but a disease* with which the Individualist society is suffering at present, on account of its having wrongly adopted the policy of Laissez Faire as its basis, and on account of the failure of the latter to cope adequately with the problem of machine industry which had the peculiar characteristic in it of being a "social good" from the point of view of production and a "social evil" from that of distribution. The Laissez Faire economists grossly

failed however, to realise that social welfare depended as much upon distribution as on production, and wrongly believing that it did only on the latter, they gave the individual full liberty to do things which *though apparently consistent, were really inconsistent with the interests of society as a whole.* The "interests of society" were thus unconsciously sacrificed to those of the individuals, till at last, society become spilt up into two distinct classes—these of the "rich" and the "poor"—the former of whom have now captured the machinery of the state to themselves, and have made laws protecting their own special privileges and grinding down the poor in every way, the latter having at last become mere "hewers of wood and drawers of water" for the former. A protest against this state of things was, however, inevitable—a protest which emanated not from the poor themselves, who were unable to think out things for themselves, who had been lulled into a sort of fatalism by the teachings of their religious precepters, and who had come to regard their degradation and misery as something ordained by God and as the outcome of their own previous actions, but from a number of sensitive souls, who were "troubled in their spirits rather than in their purse", and who had been stirred

to the quick at the sight of the social tyrannies and cruelties from which the poor were suffering simply because they were poor.

The sources from which these protests came were as numerous as the nature ofthe protests themselves. There were first the Anarchists and the Communists who were ever busy digging the roots of Individualism, and who were unable to do anything against the latter so long as it worked at all satisfactorily, but who now got an excellent opportunity to excite the poor—not against Individualism as it might be made, with which their own systems could stand no comparison, but—against Individualism as it actually was, i. e. suffering from the fell disease of 'Capitalism.' There were, then, the Collectivists, who were really Communists, but who having not the courage of their conviction or who, perhaps knowing that the world was not prepared to go back to the long -discredited and monstrous system of Communism, pretended to give the individual full liberty inconsumption goods, while concentrating all production in the hands of the state, and thus called themselves the 'Socialists.' And last but not least, there were the "real Socialists" whom we propose to call the "Liberal Socialists," who were Indivi-

dualists," were animated by "Liberal" ideas, but who rebelled at the idea of the vast inequalities at present existing, and wanted to destroy "Capitalism" while retaining "Individualism". The "Liberal Socialists" therefore "want to give the individual the greatest possible liberty *consistent with the social interests*," and are, therefore, deadly opposed to the principle of extreme Laissez Faire, which they say gives the individual "the greatest possible liberty," but makes no provision for restraining that liberty *where it is inconsistent with the social interests*, and is thus more a principle of Anarchism than of Individualism. They therefore want to substitute their own philosophy in its place, and make Individualism perfect by curing it of the disease of Capitalism. We propose to devote a seperate chapter to the consideration of the proposals of the Liberal Socialists.

CHAPTER IV.

The philosophy of Liberal Socialism.

"Socialism" may shortly be defined as *an attempt to cure Individualism of the disease of Capitalism.* It, therefore, differs from Commu-

nism and Anarchism in so far as the latter do not propose to *cure* Individualism like the former but to *destroy* it, and who therefore, talk of Social Revolutions and catastrophic changes. The Socialist also sometimes does the same for he believes that when Socialism comes, i.e. when Capitalism falls, the change would have been so thoroughgoing as to be called a revolution, though he does not talk of a catastrophic change in the sense of destroying Individualism itself.

The Socialists may further be divided into those that are *Liberal* and those who are *illiberal*. The former are so called because in their *method* of work, in their *criticisms* of their opponents and in respect of the *changes* that they propose to bring about, they are guided by "Liberal" ideas, i.e. they are to be "*fair frank, and free*" in their criticism of their opponents, their methods to be perfectly constitutional, their ideals to be "democracy, liberty, and equality", and their proposals scientific and practical. We will deal with their philosophy in some detail here.

The Liberal Socialists start with the Inviduul-ist thesis that it is the duty of the state to *give the individual the greatest possible liberty consistent with the social interests.* The task of gaurding

the social interests being assigned to the state, they believe that the state cannot do it properly unless it is itself in *social* hands. Their first concern, therefore, is to make the state perfectly democratic and amenable to popular control. Having done that, they proceed forward to attack Capitalism itself, and *reduce the present inequalities in the distribution of wealth in so far as they are inconsistent with the social interests, and the variability of the income of the poor so far as possible, without greatly reducing the production, of wealth.* We will first deal with the question of inequalities and then with that of variability.

About the first, the Liberal Socialists declare that as a general rule, *no inequalities ought to be allowed unless they are necessary to provide an adequate incentive to work and should not be allowed even then if the "work" itself is of an anti-social nature, or if those inequalities tend to create a perpetual monopoly of any sort, and to give an unequal advantage to some individuals over the rest of society.* Starting with the above as their fundamental principle, they divide all accretions to a man's property into either *incomes, gifts, misappropriations and those that come to him by simple operation of law.*

We will take *incomes* first. They are either

earned or *unearned*. *Earned incomes* are those which are *necessary to be handed over to the individual in order to provide him with an adequate incentive to work*. *Unearned incomes* are those which are *not so necessary*, and which the society may well appropriate to itself without in any way affecting the said incentive. It follows, therefore that the state *should not overtax any earned incomes* and *should not leave any unearned incomes to the individual*. No man can have any right to an income which he has *not earned*. Appropriation of *unearned* incomes by private individuals is simple *robbery*, *spoliation*, and *confiscation*. The proper place for such incomes to go to is the public exchequer. The Liberal Socialists would, therefore, transfer such incomes from the individual to the society. How to do so is a difficult question. As a general rule, if *the individual receives an unearned income along with an earned one from the same source, the proper thing for the state to do is to leave the source of the income in private hands, to seperate the earned from the unearned and to appropriate the whole of the latter to itself by taxation; secondly if the unearned comes without any such earned element mixed up with it, the proper thing for the state to do is to take over the source of the income to itself, i e to nationalise the*

source. Now unearned incomes are mostly to be found in cases where there is any kind of monopoly, whether natural or artificial. All such monopolies may thus be taxed to the *full* extent of the *monopoly* revenue, and only to that extent. The *earned part thereof* should be carefully seperated therefrom, and left in private hands. The Liberal Socialists would thus tax the *industrial* monopolies, i.e. in the form of Trusts, Cartels or some such similiar things, the *land* monopolies wherever they exist, whether urban or rural, and lastly *personal* monopolies, i. e. incomes which accure to individuals *as individuals,* without their doing anything in return. (As an example of *personal* monopolies, we may cite the case of the *Mahants* of some of the famous temples in India, the *Pope* in Europe and even some of the *idols* and other objects of worship.) *Personal monopolies have always an earned element mixed up with the unearned,* the former of which must *be left with the individual,* and which must never fall short of what might be necessary to persuade the individual to continue to receive them or to maintain the *amount* of the income in tact.

Unearned incomes from land and industrial

capital may similiarly be taken by the state through taxation. Another way of preventing individuals from having unearned incomes is by breaking the monopoly wherever possible, by the introduction of competition and by the state extending *protection* to new competitors against the monopolist. The power of the userers in the villages of India may thus be broken by the introduction of *competition* for the supply of credit in the villages. The Liberal Socialists in that case would encourage with state assistence the introduction of Co-operative Credit Societies in the villages., Failing that, he would *regulate* the monopoly exercised by the userer as well as tax him to the extent of the *monopoly* revenue he enjoys.

It may be added, however, that the Liberal Socialists are opposed to the nationalisation of the monopolies and of the different agent of effecient production primarily from the point of view of production. If, therefore, there are other reasons why any particular instruments of production must be in social hands, they can have objection their being nationalized. The Post office, and the telegraphs, the railways, the mines, the roads, the bridges, the canals and the rivers must

be in social hands, as they are essential to all production, and no private individuals can be given the right to stop it by withholding them from use at their own caprice. Similiarly with other *basic* industries, and the industries of national defense. Every case, must, in short, be decided on its own merits and nationalization should be resorted to only when it is *necessary* and taxation fails to solve the problem adequately.

So much for unearned incomes. The Liberal Socialists next deal with the *earned* incomes. And in this case, they propose to follow a policy of Laissez Faire, to give the individual *full* liberty to earn the utmosts he can, and to protect him in the enjoyment of the same. Though they would impose upon such incomes a small income-tax, they would not otherwise interfere with the right ofthe individuals to appropriate such incomes to themselves.

There would thus be inequalities even under 'Liberal Socialism' due to the difference in earned incomes. But then such inequalities are *necessary* and *socially* useful. The proper way of reducing *these* inequalities is by *voluntary* transfers from those who earn more to those who earn less. How to bring about such *voluntary* transfers is a

problem by itself, and the Liberal Socialist State would have to find out devices for doing the same. It would have to encourage all charitable and philanthrophic works, by bestowing titles upon the donors or by publicly recognising their donations. It would moreover encourage the formation of "Matual Benefit Societies" and would promote *Associationism*,—which means the voluntary throwing together of the income of certain individuals and *consuming in common*—by placing such associations at some advantage against solitary individuals. Other and more effective ways of doing the same could be suggested from a practical knowledge of the society concerned.

So much again for "income," both earned and unearned. Next we will treat of "gifts," which also include "bequests". The Liberal Socialists propose to allow them to the fullest extent possible, as they are necessary to maintain the economic incentive of the donor in tact. But in no case should such gifts or bequests be allowed to make *one* individual *excessively* rich. Moderate gifts or bequests, specially to the poor are desirable and socially useful and must be encouraged by the state. But *extremely large*

gifts to any particular individual should be discouraged and in order to do so effectively, the Liberal Socialists propose to levy a progressive tax on all such gifts and bequests as on incomes, —of course, leaving a small fixed minimum as untaxed. Any efforts at evading the Inheritance tax by a dying person trying to give away his property to others in the form of gifts or bequests would have to be prevented by making the tax as high as the inheritance tax if the bequest takes place within a certain period before the man's death.

Thirdly about "misappropriations". A greater part of the inequalities of the present times are produced by these misappropiations, which must not be confounded with *unearned incomes* as we have defined them above. The latter are *legitimate at present* while the former are illegitimate, and illegal They are obtained by robbery, stealing, cheating, as bribes, or by "false insolvencies". Even at present the recepients thereof are criminally prosecuted wherever caught red-handed.

The Liberal Socialists, however, propose to go a step further and claim for the state the right to take any individual suspected of these misappro-

priations, to task and to require him to show cause why his property should not be confiscated unless he can produce reasonable evidence of their having been legitimately earned. And the most convenient time for the state to do so, is when the property of a man is transfered to others either by bequest or through inheritance. The Liberal Socialist makes this proposal for state interference with individual liberty, with very great reluctance, but he does so because it is "in the social interests" that no compromise, even after the lapse of a sufficiently long time, be made with those who have been guilty of such mis-appropriations. It is a matter of sheer disgrace to see men at present protected in their enjoyment of money earned through bribery or corruption, for ever, if they have somehow or the other escaped being caught at the time of taking the bribe or committing "robbery, theft or cheating" and to see the large number of bogus insolvents who are at present allowed to live a luxurious life, only a few years after they were so "declared", with the money which they had secreted away !

Lastly, we have the case of accretions to a man's property "by simple operation of law". The most important of such accretions are those from inhe-

ritance. It may be noted in the first place that inheritance is not the same thing as bequest. The latter is what a man decides to give to others, the former what is given to others *by law* irrespective of what the particular wishes of the deceased were. We have given the views of John Stuart Mill—whom we may describe as the first "Liberal Socialist" in England, though he did not form a school of his own-on inheritance, in Appendix A, and he may well be taken to represent the views of the Liberal Socialists in general. As a rule, we may lay down that they would not touch very small inheritances at all, but for larger amounts they would levy an inheritence tax which would be a highly progressive one, and which would not allow more than a fixed maximium to any one individual. Other cases of accretions to a man's property "by simple operation of law" might be mentioned. As a rule, such accretions must always be carefully scrutinised and allowed to operate only when there is a clear evidence as to their utility.

These are, in short, the proposals of the Liberal Socialists in order to check the inequalities in the distribution of wealth *so for as possible.* They cannot safely go beyond these

limits without seriously undermining production and without unduly interfering with the liberty of individuals.

We will next deal with the proposals of the Liberal Socialists for reducing the variability of the part of the national dividend going to the rich and the poor respectively.

About the former they do not propose to do more than merely declare illegal all "wagering contracts" and other business dealings which are purely speculative, and which are the chief cause of the variability of their income. They would, however, pay more attention to the incomes of the poor. Following Prof. Pigou's advice, they would reduce the variability of the part accruing to the poor, "*even though they thereby increase in corresponding measure the variability of the part accruing to the rich*". They would, for instance, compell the employer of labour to ensure the labourers against unemployment and to himself pay, say, half the insurance charges, the other half being provided by the state or even by the labourers themselves. They may moreover require the abolition of the system of *wages*, whether paid by time or by piece, and the substitution thereof by *salaries*, and enact laws making it a costly affair for the

employer to discharge his workers at any moment he likes, say by requiring him to pay a "discharge compensation" to the labourers. Other and more practicable proposals might be made, but it is enough for us to understand the underlying principle here.

This is in short the "prescription" offered by the Liberal Socialists to cure Individualism of the disease of Capitalism.

And we leave it to the "Liberals" of all lands to decide if they would boldly adopt it and thereby "take the winds out of the sails" of the Communists, the Anarchists and the Collectivists or whether they would conspire with the enemies of Individualism and prepare the way for a *Social Revolution* which will end with it all the civilization and the culture of the modern times and would once more plunge society, into a state of savagery and barbarism, such as it never witnessed since the beginning of the world.

Scientific Socialism.

Chapter V.

The life and the work of Karl Marx.

Karl Marx, the founder of Scientific Socialism, was born in 1818 of a German Jew father, who turned Christian, when young Marx was only six years of age. Marx began his education at a very early age and soon graduated himself from the University of Berlin. His favourite subjects were Philosophy and Economics though he had also to study Law to please his father. He received his Doctorate from the University of Berlin in 1841, at the early age of twenty-three. He then became the editor of a Berlin daily paper, but soon incurred the hostility of the Government on account of his Socialistic views. He had by this time got himself married and then removed with his wife to Paris, where he first met with his life long friend and companion F. Engels, who allied himself with Marx from that very moment to work in the cause of the Proletariats. The two friends published in 1848 the famous Communist Manifesto, for the Communist League

which had just then been started in London by some young enthusiasts.

In 1849, the "First International" or the International Workingmen's Association, as it was then called was formed under his patronage to bring the Proletariats of all lands together. There he had to carry on an incessant struggle with the Anarchists, who were fighting with him for supremacy and whom he at last defeated. The International could not, however, servive for long after these internal dissensions, and was consequently dissolved after a time. The Second International or, as it came te be called later on, "the German Social Democracy," had meanwhile been formed in Germany under the leadership of Lassalle and Marx now allied himself with the same. He took, however, only a half-hearted interest in its activities and devoted himself primarily to the task of writing his classical work, Das Capital, the first volume of which was published in 1867 and the other two after his death, by Engels, on the basis of notes prepared by Marx himself in his life-time. His health was, however, completely shattered by this time and he died a natural death in London on the 14th of March 1883.

Thus ended the life of a man who has done more than any other to bring about a complete change in the angle of vision of the working classes. It was he who was said to have inspired "hopes and fears" at the same time—"hopes" in the minds of the Proletariat classes and "fears" in those of the Bourgeoisie. The labouring classes began to look upon him as their Saviour, as the herald of a new era, a prophet sent from above to bring about their deliverance, to teach them to stand on their own legs and to win for themselves the "Kingdom of the Earth." It was not a war of hatred or spoliation, which they were to wage with the Bourgeoisie; but one for the restoration of their rights, for the 'prevention of confiscation' and for the abolition of all class priveleges and class distinctions. And every thing was to be above-board and open. There were to be no secrets about the ultimate ideals of the Proletariats. "The Communists disdain to conceal their views and aims. They openly declare that their ends can be attained only by the forcible overthrow of all existing social conditions. Let the ruling classes tremble at a Communist revolution. The Proletariats have nothing to lose but their chains. They have a world to win. Workers of all lands, unite !"—came the clarion call of the

Communist Manifesto. And the ruling classes did tremble at the very sound of these words! The "workers of the world" also did unite in a common bond of hatred towards the Bourgeoisie, "their best friends made, their powers all united," and they all prepared themselves to march to the promised land in search of "milk and honey." And not that they were alone in their struggle with the "powers that be." The "stars in their courses" were also fighting on their side, which made the eventual truimph of the Proletariats "as certain as next morning's sunrise." The present Capitalist system could not last for long, as "it generates the very forces that must in the end overthrow it," by creating a "reserve army of the parmanently unemployed Proletariats," who would sooner or later become its own "grave-diggers."

And how did he support his conclusions? What proof had he that the time *must* come sooner or later when the Proletariat classes would all unite and throw off the yoke of a handful of the Bourgeoisie? Because that was the tendency of the present Capitalist system—was the answer. And the whole of Das Capital was taken up with the statement and the explanation

of that tendency. All his theories from beginning to end pointed towards the same inevitable development towards Socialism, or as Skelton puts it—"The Materialistic Interpretation of History eveals the present epoch, equally with the past ages as dominated by a class-struggle between exploiting Bourgeoisie and the exploited Proletariats. The theories of Value and Surplus Value lay bare the source of this exploitation. The Increasing Misery of the Proletariats brought to sore straits by the pressure of the "Industrial Reserve Army"' is finally to rouse it to revolt against the Capitalist system",

The above also explain the secret of Marx's popularity. He was a Collectivist himself, but not once has he troubled himself to weigh the merits, of Collectivism and to compare it with the rival systems of the Communists, the Anarchists, and later on, with those of the Syndicalists and the Guild Socialists. He refused to discuss these various schemes and create dissensions within the ranks of the Proletariats by prematurely indulging in a discussion as to what would be the new order that would replace Capitalism. He would have preferred "even Anarchy" to the present system of Capitalist industry. Capitalism,

for him, was "the only enemy to fight with." And in that he took the lead, all the enemies of Capitalism following him in the wake. The Communists, the Anarchists–though Bakunin, their leader, was for a time unwilling to follow his lead,—and all the "lower sort" of mankind, no matter what their particular aims and ideals, followed him and accepted his lead, in his crusade against Capitalism. Even now when he is no more, Lenin's and Sorel's, Cole's and Tom Mann's, Spargo's and Kautsky's, unite in a common bond of allegience to his revered memory and try to prove their own claims to be his real followers as distinguished from the others. In fact, he became the leader of all the Anti-Capitalists. He was, moreover, a Socialist. Socialism *thus came to be identified with Anti-Capitalism and every man came to be called a Socialist no matter what his particular creed was, if only he was opposed to Capitalism.* It became a term of "protean" meanings, "having as many heads as a hydra," of which "if one was to be cut off, another would spring up in its place." Confusion was thus worse confounded and to be a Socialist was to be something mysterious and unexplainable. This widening of the meaning of the term led to another difficulty. The use of the same word to represent all those who were

opposed to Capitalismled men to believe that they had the same interests and aims. A false bond of union was thus created within the rank of the Proletariats, a union based not on principles of human brotherhood but on that of common hatred towards the Bourgeoisie. The Individualist thus threw his lot with the Communist and the Anarchist and began to talk of Social Revolutions and similiar other things, having forgotten that there was really no bond of union between them and that he must walk on a different road than that of theirs

What have the theories of Karl Marx, then, to do with Socialism ?, They only tend to prove that Capitalism must fall sooner or later, and then Socialism would come. Socialism was also thus inevitable, if Capitalism was so. But that is simply a truism, if Socialism simply means Anti-Capitalism. If however, by Socialism is meant Collectivism, then Marx was seriously mistaken. Even if the Proletariats are brought to the depths of misery and degradation which would oblige them to rise in revolt against the Bourgeoisie— what is there to prevent them from wresting the agents of production from the hands of the latter and appropriating them to their own use, *individually rather than collectively*?

Has this process not been going on since the begining of the world? How was it then *inevitable* that the agents of production would be socialised, i.e. Collectivism would follow, if Capitalism falls. If, then, Collectivism itself be not inevitable, is it not necessary to discuss whether it would also be desirable or not? Why then have a blind faith in the goodness of Collectivism without first proving it. Why waste all your time in showing that Capitalism must fall, and becoming hysteric over it? And what is meant by the "fall of Capitalism"? Simply that the labourers would unite against the Capitalists and would wrench the agents of production from their hands. But what is there of 'inevitability' there, in it? May not the "misery and the degradation" of the Proletariats be otherwise prevented? Shall the Capitalists hemselves be so foolish as "to kill the goose that gives the golden eggs" and allow the proletariats to "lose everything" and thus be impelled to rise and revolt against them?

And what of the Marxian Theories of Labour Value, Surplus Value and Concentration of Capital? That labour is the cause of all value, that the Capitalist is a mere parasite living on

the fruits of the industry of others, who buys that labour and thus *exploits* the labourer, gives him half a day's wage while he requires him to work for the whole day, and thus gets a Surplus Value, and that Concentration of Capital, even assuming that it is identical with *concentration of wealth*, is the result, thereof—might be very clever and ingenious, but is unconvincing. Concentration of wealth in the hands of a few rich men and the corresponding poverty of the majority of the people is an evident fact at present and no proofs are necessary to support this. Surplus-Value if we mean by the term the profits of the Capitalist, is also an established fact. But to say that that Surplus-Value was the result of Labour alone or further that all wealth is produced by Labour alone, is simply foolish, however the theories might be worded and whatever the cloak of learning and pedantry under which they are made to appear? And then the statement is made that Marx did not formulate his theories of Labour-Value or Surplus Value to base his Socialistic demands upon the "Right to the Whole Produce of Labour" but merely in order to show how Surplus Value is created, which leads to the Concentration of Capital and consequently to the "Social Revolution",

Surely the followers of Karl Marx are at present casting a slur upon his memory by putting these theories to a far more ignoble use than Marx had meant them for—to excite the labourers against the Bourgeoisie in a Class War.

And there we come to the most potent and the most dangerous part of his teachings—the doctrine of the Class-War "The history of all hitherto existing society is the history of class-struggles." This struggle has, however, been simplified in the present epoch by the spilting up of society into two great hostile camps—two great classes directly tacing each other, the Bourgeoisie and the Proletariats. The present middle class would all disappear, the rich would become richer and the poor poorer. Ultimately there would be a class-war between the labourers and the capitalists, all class-distinctions would be abolished, land and capital would be socialised, exploitation would cease, the Proletariats would abolish "their own mode of appropriation and thereby also every other previous mode of appropriation." and would fulfill their mission of "destroying all previous securities for and insurances of individual property"

Such is, in short the description of the famous

doctrine of the Class-War.

It is difficult to give any definite opinion on this subject. There is no doubt that a clash of interests exists between the labourers and the capitalists. To say that "capital" and labour are "complementary," and that therefore there can be no such clash is to confuse the whole issue. It is simply because they are "complementary" that they should be owned by the same persons. If therefore the labourers want to socialise land and capital, they could not be blamed for so doing. The capitalist classes are, moreover, determined to fight for their special privileges and would not "shrink from the greatest cruelty and perfidy" to preserve their power. There is no reason, then, why the labourers should not form themselves into a party and fight for their rights. Even the Liberal Socialists would have to organise a party of their own, in order to carry out the necessary reforms — a party which though might be led bythe "intellectuals" belonging to the "higher" classes, would consist mostly of those whose only source of income is their labour. And in countries where there is no provision for constitutional reforms and all avenues to progress

are shut off, it may be doubted whether the working classes can justly be blamed for taking to a bloody revolution. (We will deal with this point in greater detail in the next chapter) Class-War thus seems to be a necessary affair at present, unless the ruling classes change their attitude towards the workers. *It is not any favours which the latter seek at the hands of the former, but their rights.* Democracy is a sham affair unless the interests of the majority are safegaurded, and the labourers being in a majority, it is *their* interests which must predominate than those of a handful of capitalists. It is but necessary in the social interests that the exploitation of labour must cease, that Capitalism must be abolished, and that all men should get equal opportunities for the development of their individual self.

It does not follow from the above, however, that the labourers should be infused with feelings of hatred or enmity against *individual capitalist.* It is the *system* against which they are to rebell, and not merely the *men* that control that system. Inorder that it may be so, however, the must not be taught doctrines which are likely to do so. It is impossible to estimate the

amount of mischief that the theories of Labour-Value and Surplus-Value are causing among the labouring-classes. The doctrine of the Materialistic Interpretatation of History has made them more materialistic than they otherwise would have been. It is simply disgusting to read the joint American writers on Socialism (Messrs. Spargo and Arnor) waxing eloquent in order to show how every higher *thing* of the world—religion, art, culture, ethics, and philosophy—is the outcome to wholly material causes and is determined by the same. The philosophy of mere "bread and butter" when taught to the Proletariats can lead to no good results, and serves merely to create ill-will between them and the capitalists. Materialism is egoism pure and simple, and the "ego" talks more of the self than of the society. It leads to a clash with those who injure the "self" and not to a change in the social 'system.' At least it prevents the Proletariats from realising the central truth of Marx's teachings—that "the capitalists themselves are the victims of the system under which they are living". Class-War in that terrible aspect of it in which it excites the labourers to indulge in sabotages and similiar other things, or which leads to the use of the bomb and the dynamite is a terrible thing and

can only be justified when the capitalists have practically made it impossible for the Proletariats to otherwise attain their object. But where there are open the least avenues to constitutional progress, the only form in which the Class-War can be tolerated is that of "Parties" in the Legislature—the party moreover being actuated, not by a desire to exalt its own self, or to win any special privileges for itself as against the others, but simply to carry through certain measures which, though they might temporarily injure the interests of a particular class, are necessary in the social interests to be adopted.

That is in short the life and the work of Karl Marx. We do not propose to devote any more time to his *theories*, for we hold they have no direct bearing on our subject. We will therefore devote, the rest part of this book to describe "Socialism" proper and the various problems that have arisen in connection therewith.

CHAPTER VI.

Revolution versus Evolution.

The question is sometimes asked as to whether Socialism was to be brought about by evolution or by revolution. The Socialists, themselves, talk of Socialism being a *revolutionary movement.* They use the term "revolution," however, in a sense different from that of the Communists, the Anarchists, the Guild Socialists and the Syndicalists, who believe that constitutional methods can never lead to the establishment of their own systems, and that they must only look up to some sort of Direct Action to achieve their object. These various systems propose to give exceptional powers to certain minorities and therefore believe in revolution rather than evolution. These people, deny the right of the landlords or the capitalists to get any compensation for their possessions and wants to deprive them of these by sheer dint of force. They are moreover, opposed to the method of slow progress and hope to achieve in a day by means of a revolution what it would have taken them years to achieve by constitutional means. The Fabians of England and the Social Demo-

crats of Germany, on the other hand,—who are by the way the real Socialists, in as much as they propose to socialise only those agents of production which are "socially used," and not *all* the agents of production—hold that Socialism is a revolutionary movement in the sense that it *aims at a complete transformation of the present order.* The word "revolution", they declare, refers "*not to the method of change, but to the change itself;*" "*it is the end, not the means to the end.*" The *method* of the Fabians and that of the German Social Democrats is one of evolution, of peaceful reforms and of progress by constitutional means They believe that violence or bloodshed can never bring Socialism. "To talk of revolution as a Socialist method," writes Mr. J. R. Macdonald, "is wrong. Revolution can never bring Socialism, because the change which the Socialists contemplate is one which will affect every fibre of society, and which must therefore be an organic process" and he adds further that "changes in the superficial things of Government may be affected by an appeal to the sword, but a change, which is to readjust the process of wealth production and of national and international exchange, which is to establish some system of justice in settling the relations between

services and rewards and which is to end the economic organization which produces too much wealth on the one side and too much poverty on the other, is not the kind of change to which revolutions can contribute anything." The Fabians and the German Social Democrats are therefore generally refered to as the Evolutionists (or as they prefer to call themselves the "Revolutionary Evolutionists"), as distinguished from the Bolsheviks and the Syndicalists who are called the Revolutionists. •

What is interesting, in this connection, however, is not this difference of opinion within the ranks of the Socialists over the question of the "method" by which Socialism is to be brought about—for such differences are more or less common between the adherents of any world wide creed — but the fact that both the above-mentioned groups of the Socialists claim to be the faithful followers of Karl Marx in this respect. The Revolutionists, whose chief Leader was the late N. Lenin, declare that Marx was an uncompromising revolutionary, and they quote the following passages from the Communist Manifesto in support of their view:— "The communists disdain to conceal their views and

aims. They openly declare their ends can only be attained by the *forcible overthrow* of all existing social conditions Let the ruling classes tremble at a communists revolution" and also that "Lastly the class-war breaks out into open revolution and the *violent overthrow* of the Bourgeoise lays the foundation for the sway of the Proletariats." Lenin regards the above passages as containing the true teachings of Marx and therefore complains somewhat bitterly, that "at the present time much adulterating of Marxism was going on" and that "people were trying to blunt the revolutionary edge of his teachings and have made of Socialism merely a reformist movement which is not quite unacceptable to the Bourgeoise." Lenin is supported in this view by an eminent Professor of Economics in Scotland, who in his recent publication "Revival of Marxism" declares that Lenin and his other Bolshevik friends are, the real follower of Karl Marx in that they are returning to his true teachings, "to the initial reading of Marx's doctrines" and are thus once more *reviving Marxism* which the great professor believes to have been abondoned by the German Social Democrats when "they adopted Ferdinand Lassalle'' Reformist Erfurt Program at the

Hanover Congress of 1899."

The Evolutionists on the other hand, led by Karl Kautsky, the leader of the "Second International," declare that though Marx was an out and out revolutionary when he wrote the Communist Manifesto he had changed his mind as to the advisability of bringing about Socialism by means of a bloody revolution, after he had witnessed with his own eyes the condition of France after the revolution of 1848. He then gave up his revolutionary ideas for good and became so much hostile to revolutionary methods that he resigned in 1850 from the executive of the Communist League on the ground that his fellow-Socialists were substituting "revolutionary phrases" for "revolutionary evolution." The Evolutionists declare therefore that Lenin was going against the matured and considered views of Karl Marx in advocating a bloody revolution in Russia.

Now, what is the correct view? Was Karl Marx an out and out revolutionary as Lenin and the author of the "Revival of Marxism," believed him to be, or was he, merely a "revolutionary evolutionist' as Karl Kautsky declares he was. The answer is that he was neither wholly the one nor the other. Speaking at the Congress of

the International at Hague in 1872, he had declared:- "But we do not assert that the way to reach the goal is the same everywhere. Countries like England and America may attain their object by peaceful means, but not in all countries is this the case." It is thus abundantly clear from the above quotation that after a full twenty year's study of the problem, he had come to the conclusion that neither revolution, nor evolution could solely be relied upon to bring about Socialism in all lands, irrespective of the political and the economic conditions of each. He would then have allowed England and America to make progress by constitutional means, perhaps as gladly as he would have sanctioned a violent and bloody revolution in Russia where, according to Paul Miliukov ("Bolshevism"), "if Socialism was to be successful at all, it could only be so through a revolution, for under the autocratic rule of the Czar, there was little room for Parliamentary reforms." If therefore we understand by a man's true teachings his most matured and considered views, it is wrong to assert that the Marx of the Manifesto was the true Marx, specially when we remember that he had expressly disassociated himself in his own life-time from

his views as expressed in the manifesto and had declared "as early as 1872 in concert with Engels, that they wished to republish the Manifesto *only as a historical document*". (Vide, Bebel's reply to Dr. David at the Bernstein debate at the Lubeck Congress of 1901, in a discussion on the "Theory of Increasing Misery.") This last declaration, therefore, finally rules out of court any views expressed by Marx in the Manifesto, specially when there is some other evidence to show that he had expressly revised them on a particular point, such as the present one, at a later stage of his life.

We may therefore summarise our conclusion by saying that while both Lenin and Kautsky are *right nationally*, they are both *wrong internationally* in their interpretation of Marx's teachings. They both made the mistake of thinking that the method which was best suited to the peculiar circumstances of their own country was also the most appropriate for the whole world. The author of the "Revival of Marxism" seems also to have been obviously misled in this respect when he calls the Bolshevic Revolution of Russia a "*Revival* of Marxism, thus suggesting that the Evolutionary Socialists of Germany and England were not Marxists at

all in this respect. The true view of Marx, as of all reasonable men is likely to be, was that "*Each country ought to be treated on the merits of its own case*".

Chapter VII.

The Theory of Increasing Misery.

The "Theory of Increasing Misery" has been another controversial topic of Socialist thought. It is stated in the Communist Manifesto, that there is a constant tendency for the Proletariats to "sink beneath the degrading conditions of their own class," till at last they are all sunk into the very depths of misery and degradation, and having "nothing to lose, but their chains" break out into open revolution against the Bourgeoise. They would then "seize the torch that Stephens has reached to them" and their war against the Bourgeoise would be "the bloodiest ever waged".

The orthodox Marxians had concluded from the above statement of the theory that any attempt at the social amelioration of the Proletariats whether by the State, the employers or even by themselves was likely to defer the day of their salvation more and more into the future, and even to make the Proletariats content with

present conditions and thus to "steal their thunder". Welfare work on the part of the employers was specially resented and was termed "Benevolent Feudalism". Even Trade Union action by the labourers themselves was objected to for the same reasons and there was therefore a bitter hostility between the Socialists and the Trade Unionists in the first few decades of the rise of Marxian Socialism. There was then a tendency for the Socialists to leave the wage-earners to their own fate and even to glory in their "Misery" as it was regarded by them to bring the day of their salvation all the nearer .

But saner views have begun of late to be held even by the most orthodox Marxists. It has now come to be realised that men, sunk in the very depths of degradation and having *really* "nothing else to lose but their misery" are not those who can safely be relied upon to bring about a change in the economic structure of Society. Such men might be successful in overthrowing the present Capitalist class, but could not be expected to abolish all classes, "including their own class" or as Mr. B. Russell puts it ("Bolshevism") "No great, good is to be expected from men sunk in the depths of degradation for such are generally men more anxious to injure their

opponents than to benefit the world at large". Leibknecht is always frank in the statement of his views. "Formerly," says he, "people used often to say that the only means of winning the masses to Socialism was to leave them alone, till their impoverishment was complete and then despair would bring them to us, but no one believes in that nonsense any longer."

The question was therefore raised lately by some of the leading Revisionists including Bernstein himself as to the desirability of excluding any mention of the theory as an integral part of Socialism. The matter came up for discussion at the Bernstein debate at the Lubeck Congress in 1901, where Karl Kautsky declared that" the theory was no longer believed in by any reasonable man and that Karl Marx had himself refuted it in his Capital". "Increasing Misery." he continued, "is to be understood as a tendency and not as an unconditional truth. It means only that Capital in order to increase its Surplus-Value, must tend to make the position of the worker ever more and more miserable. That we know. But Marx himself had indicated the counter tendency. He himself was one of the first champions of laws protecting the workers, one of the first who drew attention to the

importance of Trade Unions as early as 1847 We differ then from the Bourgeoise reformers, who think that this tendency can be overcome and social peace established within the present order of things. But we believe that such is the tendency of "Capital" and until the instruments of its economic and political power are wrenched from it, social peace can not be restored and this is the only sense in which we hold fast to the Theory of Increasing Misery."

To this an objection was raised by Dr. David, a leading Revisionist saying that not the smallest reference was made in the Manifesto to Trade Union Organizations, but on the other hand, Marx dreamt of a social revolution in which the workers "would break their chains" when "they had nothing to lose," thus showing that according to the Manifesto the only salvation of the Proletariats lay in the extremes of misery. But this objection of Dr. David was replied to by Babel who declared that "it was futile to appeal to the Manifesto for as early as 1872, Marx and Engels had declared that they wished to republish it *only as a historical document*," and also that Marx believed that by organisation, the working class can counteract the depressing tendencies of capital

and if by the strength of their organization, they succeeded in inciting the state to take such steps, then it was not merely a great moral advance, but the victory of a new principle."

The Theory of Increasing Misery is thus still believed in by the majority of the Socialists and must be retained as an integral part of Marxian Socialism. But in order that it may be so, it must be properly understood. It means that there is a tendency in the present Capitalist System for the gap between the rich and the poor to become wider which is an undesirable thing in itself and not that the workers tend to sink lower and lower into degradation, a fact which may be shown to be false, seeing that the workers at present are practically better off than they were at any time before. The Modern Socialist therefore does not tell the labourer to wait till he sinks into degradation before he can attain salvation, but to strike for freedom, while there is still some power left in him, and to welcome all reforms as they would enable him to rise more and more in the Social scale and to become all the more strong for the protection of his rights.

Chapter VIII.

Socialism as a Movement.

(a) A Proletarian Movement.

Socialism is a proletarian movement because it aims at the economic emancipation of the Proletariat class and to put an end to their exploitation at the hands of the Bourgeoise which is daily going on under the present Capitalist regime. But because the movement has been termed a proletarian one, it must not be supposed that it is composed of the Labourers alone. On the other hand, some of its leading thinkers and advocates have come from the middle or even in some cases from the capitalist class and have spent their lives in the cause of the Proletariats because "they were troubled in their spirits, rather than in their purse". But these men differed from the Utopians who believed that the Social revolution could only be brought about with the aid and sympathy of the Bourgeoise, and declared on the contrary that though some members of the Capitalist class might guide or help the Proletariats, the real task of their liberation had to be performed by the Proletariats themselves, who must learn to stand on their own legs and to work even in the teeth of opposition of the Bourgeoise class.

(b) A Political Movement.

Socialism is a political movement in the sense that it aims at bringing about the political organizations of the different countries of the world under the control of the Proletariats, who would then bring about the necessary economic reforms through the political machinery of the State. The Socialists believe that the control by the Proletariats, of the political organization of each country was essential to the stability of Socialism. Secondly that the form of Government was to be a democratic one or else it would not be a Social state, but a huge Beaucracy. The Socialists in their political capacity therefore demand the early establishment of Democracy and Socialism has therefore been well-called the "Twin-Sister of Democracy".

(c) An International movement, but not therefore an anti-national one.

Socialism is an International Movement in two different senses. Firstly because, as Mr. John Spargo says ("Social Democracy Explained"), "it has a place in the political life of all those modern Nations in which Industrialism has developed," and secondly because, "it is so in spirit, being filled with the conscious purpose

of uniting the workers of all lands and ultimately bringing about the World Republic."

It was because the Proletariates of all lands had a common enemy in Capitalism to fight with that Marx thought it necessary for all of them to unite and consequently devoted a greater part of his time to the task of bringing home to them the idea of the International solidarity of the labourers. Since the days of Marx, the above idea has been translated into action and instead of having seperate movements for different countries, we have International Congresses where "the Proletariats of all countries unite, and pass resolutions concerning the common interests of them all. Nor are the leaders of Socialist thought any the less imbued with feelings of Internationalism. Writing about Lenin in his book on "Bolshevism", Mr. Bertrand Russel remarks, "Lenin, the true Communist as he is, is thoroughly international. He is not more concerned with the interests of Russia than with those of other countries. Lenin would sacrifice Russia rather than the Revolution, if the alternative should ever arise."

But from the above, it should not be concluded that Socialism is in any way an anti-

national movement. Nationalism is a desirable thing only in so far as it conduces to the true happiness of mankind. But present day Nationalism, say the Socialists, falls far short of achieving that object, for at present it works mainly in the interest of the ruling classes, who are the Capitalists, and ignores altogether the interests and the well-being of the majority of the people who are the Proletariats. The Socialists believe that true Nationalism would only be possible when International peace is established, and when in the words of the poet:—

"Each nation works for the other's good,
And all of them live in noble brotherhood".

Chapter IX.

The Socialist State.

The Socialists refuse to give all the details of how the Socialist State would be constituted and what would be its economic structure. Nevertheless, the following points, among others, may be noted, on which the Socialists may be said to be more or less agreed;—

(4) The Socialist state would own only those *agents of production* that are *socially* used. Social ownership is looked upon not as an end

in itself, but as a means of putting an end to all forms of exploitation. Where no exploitation is involved, private ownership would remain unaffected under Socialism.

(2) The Socialist State would only be an amended form of present day Capitalism, with this only difference that exploitation of one man's labour by another would be put an end to, and some attempt would be made to introduce the element of justice in distribution. It would thus be arrived at by an organic process and the Socialists therefore believe in Evolution rather than in Revolution, as the method best suited to achieve their object.

(3) The Socialist State would assume a monopoly of credit functions and of final land-ownership. But it is not necessary that it would also manage them itself. It might as well delegate their managment to private individuals on temporary leases.

(4) The Socialists have tried to deal with the question of distribution in the Socialist state in greater detail. There are three possible methods:—(a) An equal division to all regardless of needs or services rendered. (b) To each according to needs or wants. (c) To each according to his work.

No Socialist party is ever heard at present advocating the first alternative inspite of the strong support it received at the hands of Cabet who maintained that "it would not be just to punish in any way those whom fortune had meanly endowed by giving to the man who was more able or intelligent more than others who were less so". To reward men according to ability or intellegence because these qualities were only gifts of nature according to him was utterly unjust, and therefore, he held that "Society should redress the inequality produced by blind chance and give to all an equal share of the common store". But in view of the fact that an equal division to all would practically do away with the economic incentive to work, and would thus greatly reduce production, any such proposal would fail to achieve the very object it has in view, and must therefore be brushed aside as obsolutely self-condemned.

About the second alternative, the Socialists say that it is a Communist rather than a strictly Socialist proposal and point out the difficulties to which it would lead in actual practice. The wants of an individual, say the Socialists, are so indefinite, subjective and variable

that they cannot be safely relied upon as the basis for the distribution of wealth. Nor is it true that distribution according to wants would be more equitable than that according to services rendered. On the other hand it seems a little more just "to take from each according to his needs and give to each according to his abilities," as is done at present than "to take from each according to his abilities, and give to each according to his needs." as the Communists suggest. The Socialists also seem to have recognised the truth of this statement when they propose to reward men according to services rather than according to needs. Their basis of distribution would thus be in essentials, the same as is at present in existence, with this only difference that greater efforts will be made under Socialism than at present to give an equal start to all in life or as the Socialists like to put it, "an equality or Communism of Opportunity would prevail," with of course the share of the landlords and the Capitalists going to the state.

CHAPTER X.

Reform program of Socialism.

Marx and Engels laid down the following measures in the Communist Manifesto, which

they thought would be pretty generally applicable in some of the advanced countries:-

(1) Abolition of property in land and application of all rents of land to public purposes.

(2) A heavy progressive or graduated income-tax.

(3) Abolition of all rights of inheritance.

(4) Confiscation of the property of all emigrants and rebels.

(5) Centralization of credit in the hands of the state by means of a national bank with state capital and an exchange monopoly.

(6) Centralization of the means of communication and transport in the hands of the state.

(7) Extension of factories and instruments of production, owned by the State. The bringing into cultivation of waste lands and the improvement of the soil generally, in accordance with a common plan.

(8) Equal liability of all to labour. Establishment of industrial armies specially for agriculture.

(9) Combination of agriculture with manufacturing industries. Gradual abolition of the distinction between town and country, by a more equable distribution of the population over the country.

(10) Free education for all children in public schools. Abolition of children's factory labour in its present form. Combination of education with industrial production etc. etc:-

Some other minor reforms on which the Socialists are more or less agreed are:-

(11) Establishment of Universal Sufferage, Direct Legislation, Proportional Pepresentation and the abolition of the upper Houses of Parliament.

(12) The free administration of justice and the abolition of the powers of the courts which protect class privilege.

(13) State protection of the working class, restriction of the working period and establishment of state insurance.

(14) Extension of publie health legislation, and promotion of temperence.

(15) Payment of some form of adequate compensation to the expropriated owners of industry.

CHAPTEE XI.

Methods of bringing about Collective Ownership.

There is also a great difference of opinion among the Socialists as to the method by which collective ownership was to be brought about. In

essentials, this question is not much different from that of whether Socialism was to be brought about by revolution or evolution. Broadly speaking we may say that the majority of the Revolutionists believe in the method of confiscation, while the Evolutionists mostly in that of compensation.

The advocates of confiscation declare that the present landlords and the capitalists have no rights in their property and do nct therefore deserve to be compensated for it in any way. The Capitalist has "grown fat" by appropriating Surplus-Value, to which according to strict Socialist theory he had no right and which in justice belonged to the workers. Similiarly with the landlords. These people, say the confiscators, came in possession of their lands "*not by the expenditure of labour, or the results of labour on the land, but by force,*" and must therefore be turned outbyforce. The argument that the Surplus-Value which the Capitalist has accumulated was not due to the single productivity of labour, but to the factors of Waiting and Uncertainty-Bearing and that the present-day landlords did not come in possession of their lands by force but by lawful purchase or inheritance from the original owners, or had received them as gifts from the

state, does not appeal to them in the least. Truly speaking, they do not believe in any argument but that of force. "We Industrial Unionists," wrote Giovanitti, the leader of the I. W. W. of America, "Care nothing about proving it. Whether we are ethically justified in so doing or not is not our concern. We will lose no time proving title to them beforehand, but we may if it is necessary after the thing is done, hire a couple of lawyers and judges to fix up the deed and make the transfer perfactly legal and respectable. Anything that is powerful becomes in the course of time righteous. Therefore we claim that the *Social Revolution is not a matter of necessity plus justice, but of necessity plus strength.*" It would, therefore, be futile to waste any more words in arguing things out with these men, and we would therefore, leave them to their own fate and would pass over to the others.

The advocates of the method of compensation hold on the other hand, that the evils of the present day are not due to any fault of the individual capitalists or the landlords, but to the *system* of unrestrained private ownership of the agents of production which has been in vogue in nearly all the countries of the world from times immemorial. Socety has uptil now been always

recognising such rights and on the basis of that recognition, men have invested money in these things, which they would otherwise have spent on consumable goods, or kept in reserve for some rainy day. If now, therefore, it is necessary in the Social interest to Nationalise land and Capital, we have a perfect right to do so, *provided we pay full compensation to the expropriated landlords and the Capitalists.* If we do so, the latter can have no justification in resisting the proposal, or else it would be a shame-faced confession on their part of the fact that they were earning in these industries more than they could legitimately earn elsewhere, nor could they justly blame the Socialists, if they are in that case obliged to carry through the necessary reform by force. But let us hope for the present that such an unpleasant contingency would never arise and pass on to the question whether "full compensation" is a practical proposal or not. Much ingenuity has of late been applied to find out a satisfactory solution of this problem. Obsolute payment in cash is clearly an impossibility and proposals have therefore been made to make the payment by means of public bonds which are to be non-interest bearing and then to gradually eliminate them within a reason-

able period by means of a graduated income-tax and an inheritance tax [See Ch. XII sec (b)], without thus inflicting any special injury on any particular individual. The above proposal has not, however, been universally accepted and we can only assert for the present that there is a great divergence of opinion within the ranks of the Evolutionists as to the actual details of making the payment, though they are all agreed as to its desirability.

CHAPTER XII.

The Relations.

Sec. (a) Socialism and Private Property.

A great confusion is prevalent in the general mind as to the relation of Socialism to private property. It is generally believed that the Socialists want to abolish all private property. The latter however deny the charge most emphatically. "Individuality" writes Mr. J.. R Macdonald, "requires private property through which to express itself. Man must control and own something, otherwise he does not control and own himself." They thus believe that every man must have some property over which he is to have an exclusive control and which he may call his own. But they add that the pre-

sent system by allowing private property in the indispensable agents of production, such as land and industrial capital, has made it almost impossible for the majority of men to own any property whatsoever, and has practically reduced them to a condition of Wage-Slavery.

They therefore want to socialise those agents of production which involve exploitation of others labour and which when left in private hands, invariably tend to deprive a thousand others of even the most elementary rights of property. They are thus opposed not to *private property* as a whole, but only to *private Capitalism.*

Sec. (b) Socialism and Inheritance

The Socialists do not want to abolish inheritance altogether. They recognise the fact that if they do so the "*economic incentive to work*" (See Ch. XIII) would be greatly reduced. They would not however, allow inheritance to devolve wholly as it does at present but would regulate it in such a way as to take away for the state as much as may safely be done so without materially affecting the said incentive. Where therefore, there is no such danger as in the case of a man dying without any near or dear ones, they would escheat the whole of his property to the state. In the

other case i. e., where the deceased leaves any children behind him, the Socialists would not take the whole of his property at one stroke, but would so arrange the inheritance tax as to take it in the course of say, three or four generations. Signor Rignano, proposes to confiscate $\frac{1}{3}$ of the property of the deceased on his death, giving the remaining $\frac{2}{3}$ to his sons. On the death of the latter $\frac{1}{2}$ of the inherited property would be taken away by the state, the remaining $\frac{1}{2}$ being left to the descendents of the deceased to be wholly confiscated on their death. A dies, for instance, leaving 900 Rupees and a son B. According to the above proposal, the state would take 300 Rupees for itself, giving 600 Rupees to B. Now B dies leaving 900 Rupees, and a son C. Here 600 Rs. would be considered as that part of A's property which had been inherited from him by B,—irrespective of the consideration whether it was the same property or that he had first squandered the whole of it away and had then made a new fortune afresh,—and of this $\frac{1}{2}$ i. e. Rs. 300 would be taken away by the state, the other half being left to C. The remaining Rs. 300 which B has left would be considered his own earning. Of this $\frac{1}{3}$ i. e. Rs. 100 would

be taken away by the state, leaving the remaining 200 Rs. to C. Now suppose again that C dies leaving Rs. 800 and a son D. Of these Rs. 300 would be considered A's property and would be wholly taken away by the state. Rs 200 would be considered as B's property and of this $\frac{1}{2}$ i. e. Rs. 100 would go to the state leaving only Rs. 100 for D. Of the remaining Rs. 300 cf C's property, $\frac{1}{3}$ i. e. Rs. 100 would be taken away by the state leaving Rs. 200 to D. And so on *ad infinitum* The whole property left by A would thus have been confiscated by the time C dies.

Signor Rignano has great faith in the efficacy of the above proposal and hopes to take away in this way for the state the whole of the property of the deceased without materially affecting the *economic incentive to work*, and also giving thereby to the descendents of the deceased a fair share of his property to enable them to get a decent start in life. In any case the evils of the present system of unrestricted inheritance would be greatly reduced thereby and it may be hoped that the proposal would find favour with not a few Socialists.

It may however be noted this connection that

the above proposal would be a little difficult to be worked out in a joint family system such as is prevalent among the Hindus, under the Mitakshara Law, where the joint-family property does not belong to any specific individual, but to the family as a whole. It would be necessary in that case to modify the system of undivided family property in such a way as to allow S. Rignanos proposal to be carried out in practice, and it would really be an interesting problem for the Indian Jurists to find out in what way, they could do so without materially affecting the joint-family system itself. However, we must leave this part of the subject now and proceed forward to study the relation of Socialism to the Family and Marriage.

Sec. (c) Socialism and the family and Marriage.

The attitude of the Socialists towards the family and the institution of marriage has been grossly misunderstood. They are said to aim at the abolition of both and at "Socializing" women and children. They however strongly deny the above charges, and hold on the contrary that the family and marriage are perhaps the most ancient and the most permanent of all social institutions and have been the most pregnant in their effects both upon the individual

as well as the community. They hold therefore that anything which takes from these institutions their essential responsibilities would have an evil effect on both the individual as well as the society. One of their chief criticisms against the present Capitalist regime is that "it has torn away from the family its sentimental veil and has reduced the family relation to a mere money relation". They therefore want to purify and elevate both these institutions "by eliminating the mercinary element so common in the marriages of the present day" and by relieving women of their extreme dependence on men for their livelihood.

The Socialists would obsolutely forbid the marriage of boys and girls below a particular age, and would require all marriages to be registered in the municipal offices and an upto-date record kept of them. They would make the divorce a little more difficult and costly an affair and would make prostitution illegal. They would, moreover, obsolutely forbid the marriage of persons suffering from some of the fell diseases and from certain physical and mental defects.

About the attitude of the Socialists towards children, we have simply to note they do not

propose to "socialize" or to otherwise reduce the authority of their parents over them, for they believe that by so doing they would destroy all the charms of family-life. But the Socialist state would certainly interfere in cases where the parents of the children do things which are prejudicial to the interests of the latter, and would even take upon itself the task of feeding and educating them till they are able to settle in life, in case their parents are unable to support them.

Besides carrying out the above reforms, the Socialists do not propose to change the above institutions in any other way.

Sec. (d) Socialism and Machinery.

The Socialists are not opposed to machinery as such, but, only when it is worked as under present conditions so as to involve the *exploitation of one man's labour by another.* They do not believe that there is anything inherently bad in machinery or that it is the cause of all the evils of the present day. "I donot admit" wrote William Morris, "that our surroundings will never get pleasant so long as we are surrounded by machinery. It is the allowing machines to be our masters

and not our servants, that so injures the beauty of life now-a-days".

The Socialists recognise the great labour saving properties of machines, and instead of destroying them altogether, they would transfer their ownership and control from the hands of a few competing individuals to those of the state. But their present opposition to it is natural and instinctive. "A man" writes Mr. Macdonald, "working with *his own machinery* is glad to be told of methods to economise his labour. Men working with *other people's* mechinery regard such methods *as a notice for some of them to begin walking the streets*". When once they are socialised the hostility of the Socialists, against them would also vanish for the state would then have to supply work to those who become unemployed as a result of the introduction of such economies, whereas at present, they are thrown out into the world to "walk the streets or sit at home."

Sec. (e) Socialism and Religion.

"Law, morality and *religion*" says the Communist Manifesto "are to the Proletariats so many Bourgeoise prejudices, behind which

lurk in ambush just as many Bourgeoise interests.' The critics of Socialism have concluded from the above that the Socialists are opposed to all forms of religion, and religious beliefs. The latter reply however that though religion in itself is an ennobling thing, yet that it is at present being used to exploit the Proletariats, and that the priests have practically sold themselves off to the Bourgeoise and are lending them their moral support to keep the Proletariats in subjection, in return for their maintenance. The Socialists therefore want to abolish the priestly class as they regard its activities as a great obstacle in the path of the Proletariats. Otherwise they do not propose to interfere with a man's private beliefs. The German Social Democracy has expressly declared by resolutions at its congresses that "religion is a private concern of the individual with which society in its corporate capacity has nothing to do." Even at present the ranks of the Socialists are replete with men holding nearly all shades of religious views. "Many good Christians," says Mr. Philip Snowdon, "are Socialists because they believe that the existing economic order is anti-Christian, and that Socialism is seeking to establish an industrial and

a social order, based upon the ethical principles upon which the Christian religion is founded." He adds further that Socialism is a practical religion as it is trying to establish the kingdom of "right doing" upon earth, to overthrow a system of competition and "to put in its place, one where it will be possible for men to live together like brothers."

Sec. (f) Socialism and Art.

It is also held by some that Socialism will destroy art, which fact is also denied by the Socialists, who hold that Capitalism makes it impossible for the majority of men to cultivate art and that in Socialism lies the only hope for its future development. "Slavery" says William Morris, "lies between us and art," which he defines as "man's expression of his joy in labour", and the conditions which he considers to be necessaryfor its cultivation are, firstly that the work which one isrequired to do must be worth doing, secondly that it should be of itself pleasant to do, and lastly that the labour required should not be such as to degrade the worker, morally, spiritually or physically. "All these things", says he, "are lacking at present and will be present under Socialism.' He therefore

appeals to the lovers of art to make an universal attempt to bring about Socialism at the earliest possible moment "so that art may flourish".

The misconception of the anti-Socialists is based upon the false-presumption that the Socialist state would dictate to all its subjects the work that they are to do, irrespective of the temperament and the inclination of each. Far from that being the case, the Socialists assert that the greatest scope will be given under Socialism to all to take to those professions for which they are best suited. This is not possible, say the Socialists, in the present age of wage-slavery where only a few rich men have that privilege, while the greater mass of the people have to throw themselves on the market to earn their livelihood wherever they can, irrespective of whether they like the work that they are required to do or not. Much of the present day work is consequently irksome and this fact also accounts for the lack of the artistic faculty in the mass of the people under the present Capitalist regime.

Sec. (g) Socialism and Liberty.

It was Herbert Spencer who first declared that Socialism will turn men into slaves and deprive

hem of all the freedom of action which they possess at present. In his book, "Man vs.The State," he calls it "the coming Slavery," because he believed that all "all Socialism implies slavery." J. S. Mill, on the other hand, while holding that there was some weight in the above view of Herbert Spencer, thought still that it was vastly exxagerated, "because the members of the associations need not be required to live together more than they live now, nor need they be controlled in the disposal of their individual share of the produce· nor yet in the disposal of the large leisure they would probably possess. Individuals need not be chained to an occupation, or to a particular locality." Mill moreover thought that Mr. H. Spencer's objection applied with far greater force to the present order under which the majority of the worker enjoy no real liberty and are "practically as dependent on the will of others as they could be in any system short of actual slavery."

Here Mill, though not himself a Socialist, fully represents the view of the Socialists, who declare that they are out to destroy the slavery of the present order, which they term as "wage-slavery," and "to establish the reign of freedom

on earth." This objection of H. Spencer against Socialism is also based upon the false notion that under Socialism, the state would dictate to all itssubjects, the work that they are to do, which if it be so would certainly be a denial of all individual liberty. This misconception is the outcome of a great confusion in the popular mind of Socialism and Communism being the same, which is not the case. There is no doubt that under Communism there will be some force applied by the state to compell men to work, but it will not be so under Socialism, and the above objection has not therefore much force when made against the latter.

Sec. (h) Socialism and the State.

"Each step in the development of the Bourgeoise," says the Communist Manifesto, "was accompanied by a corresponding political advance of that class, which has at last conquered for itself in the modern representative state exclusive political sway. The executive of the modern state is but a committee for managing the common affairs of the whole Bourgeoise." The state itself is described in the Manifesto as the "product and the manifestation

of the irreconcibility of class-contradictions," also, as an "organism of class domination," and is said to exist only to "moderate the acuteness of those contradictions", but always taking indirectly the side of the Bourgeoise in its struggle with the Proletariats. The latter have also realised this fact, and their practical experience seems to confirm it. In all the struggles of the Proletariats with the Bourgeoise, the state has always come forward to protect the so-called vested interests of the latter, with the greatest possible tenacity and to crush all opposition of the Proletariats against it. The Socialists have therefore come to identify the state with the Bourgeoise and to regard it as an equally formidable enemy of the Proletariats. Their opposition to it is consequently, instinctive and natural. But unlike the Anarchists, the Socialists do not hold that there is anything inherently bad in the institution of the state itself. Many of its functions— that of justice, defence, and the industrial ones— are such as cannot be done away with, without extreme hardship to society. The Socialists therefore, do not want to abolish the state altogether like the Anarchists, but propose on

the other hand to bring it under their control. "The other functions of the state," writes Mr. J. Spargo in his "Social Democracy Explained," "are so vital to the existence of society that no reasonable man would talk of abolishing the state altogether, but the same fact affords a good reason why the workers should struggle to obtain control of it. All that is needed is a change in the use of the power." The Socialists moreover hope that when once the state comes into the hands of the Proletariats, the latter would use it for the good of the whole society and not only for that of a particular class as is the case at present.

The above view is that of the most upto-date Socialists of the present times. The strictly Marxian view, was, however, a little different one, which may shortly be stated in the words of Pasvolsky ("Economics of Communism") who says that "the trend of economic development was irresistably in the direction of such an organization of society in which the division into classes will be inevitably abolished, the classes as such will cease to exist and the state itself being a product of class divisions is bound to become superfluous." Engels termed the last phenomenon as the "dying off" of the state,

in the process of the economic reorganization of society. Lenin, who claimed to be a thoroughgoing Marxist, carried the idea further and maintained that Engel's view applied to the *second* stage of evolution, while the *first* called for different methods.

In the very first stage, said he, the Capitalist state was to be destroyed forcibly and quickly by means of a violent revolution, and its place taken by a Proletarian state built nearly along the same lines as the Capitalist one. The Proletariats would not thus destroy the state altogether, but would capture it to themselves, and be its dictators, until the "Expropriators are all expropriated", and for ever merged into the Proletariats. All class distinctions being thus abolished, the need for the state itself, which exists only to "moderate the acuteness of class, contradictions",- would disappear, and it would then automatically "die off." Lenin was however reported to have changed his views after the Revolutions of 1917, and to have altogether given up the idea of the "dying off" of the state.

There is thus no Socialist party at present in existence which believes that the state can ever be abolished altogether, and it may there-

fore be safely asserted that there is likely to be a permanent cleavage between the Socialists and the Anarchists, the one believing in the existence of the state, the other being deadly opposed to it. It may be hoped however, that, the Anarchists would soon realise their mistake and would come over to the view point of the Socialists, which is perhaps the only one consistent with right judgment.

Sec. (i) Socialism and Individualism.

The popular conception that Socialism and Individualism are mutually exclusive terms and that therefore, the former would be a denial of the latter, is based upon a misconception as to the identily of Socialism with Communism. There is no doubt that Communism would repress all individuality by turning men into the "*paid wage-workers of the state,*" and crushing all individual initiative and activity, but it is wrong to suppose that Socialism would also do the same. It may be maintained on the contrary that perfect individualism can only be attained through perfect Socialism. We must note in the very first place that Individualism does not mean obsolute liberty of individuals to do as they like, irrespective of whether their actions would

or would not prejudicially affect the interests of others. The theory of the identity of interests between the individuals and the society as a whole, has long been overthrown, and the state has always found it necessary to restrict the liberty of individuals in some form or the other. If therefore the Socialists now propose to socialise those factors of production which involve exploitation of others' labours, they cannot truly be blamed for repressing individuality. Even now the state has almost abrogated to itself the task of protecting our life and property, of imparting justice and apprehending criminals, of lightening our roads and cleaning our drains and we do not find our individuality hampered in the least by its having done so, but on the contrary, it has by so doing given us more time and leisure to look to other things, which are more conductive to our individual development. There can thus be no new cause of complaint if the state now decides to socialise the most indispensable agents of production, because it is necessary in the social interests that it should do so, rather than leave them in the hands of private individuals. Socialism and Individualism are not thus contradictory, but merely complimentary terms.

Sec. (j) Socialism and Laissez Faire.

Laissez-Faire was the policy of "leaving things alone," and was a great favourite with the classical economists, who looked upon it as the best policy for the state to follow in the matter of industry and trade. By giving free vent to the self-interest of men, they hoped to enable them to produce the largest amount of wealth, which they thought was the best sign and the first condition of social progress.

The policy of Laissez-Faire was, therefore, rigidly adhered to, by some of the most advanced countries of Europe, till at last their dream of having the largest production of wealth was fully realised and they thought they were passing through exceptionally prosperous times. There was discontent, however, in the labouring classes of those countries and the cry of poverty and destitution was being raised side by side with that of increased production. While there could be seen "merchant kings", more prosperous and having more riches than even some of the greatest monarchs of the ancient times, there could also be seen a large mass of men who had not even sufficient to hide their shame or to fill their belly. Here there was a piteous spectacle for the most

zealous advocates of Laissez-Faire to pause and think Was increased production, after all, such a desirable thing as to sacrifice everything else for it? Could even the largest amount of wealth be of any use to the welfare of a nation, unless it was properly distributed? And last but not least, did Laissez-Faire ensure such a proper distribution of the nation's wealth? The answer was not a bit disappointing to the extreme believers in the policy of "Masterly Inactivity." The necessity was therefore realised of modifying the doctrine, so as to bring individual interests into harmony with the social ones, and to give the state the right to interfere in the affairs of private individuals so far as it was necessary in the social interests to do so. It is in this modified from that Laissez Faire has been in vogue in the different countries of the world for the last two centuries. Now Socialism also proposes to do the same and to take over for the state those factors of production which it is necessary in the social interests to be owned by the State, otherwise leaving competition and individual initiative and activity untouched, and it does not therefore differ much from Laissez Faire as it is understood at present. It is however bitterly opposed to the old and

long-discredited form of Laissez-Faire, which was such a great favourite with the classical economists of yore.

Sec. (K) Socialism and Tariff Reform.

The attitude of the Socialists towards questions of Tariff reform is one of obsolute indifference, for according to them "the contest between Free Trade and Protection takes for granted the permanence of the existing order of things," and that therefore "only those can be interested in it who assume that private ownership of the means of life is to be the permanent order of things". It was because of this indifference that the British Labour Party opposed, at the last general elections, the proposal of Mr. Baldwin to introduce Protection in England, and not because it had any love for the doctrine of Free Trade. The attitude of the Party towards Imperial Preference is not much different.

This indifference, say the Socialists, is only temporary and they would have to interest themselves in all these things as soon as Socialism is attained, for then, it would be possible to carry through these reforms in the interests of the whole society, and not merely in that of the capitalist class as is the case at present.

Sec. [L] Socialism and Armaments.

The attitude of the Socialists towards the armaments is also much misunderstood. The popular conception that the Socialists would demoblise all the military and the naval forces of the state as soon as they come to power, is wholly wrong and is based upon a false interpretation of their doctrine of the International Solidarity of the Labourers. No Socialist leader of note has yet declared against armaments, at least for a very long time to come. Nevertheless, they are almost unanimous as to the desirability of reducing them to the lowest possible limit consistent with national safety, and want to sustitute the present standing armies by a militia as for as possible. The Socialists would therefore make it incumbent upon all to acquire sufficient military training to enable them to defend their country against foreign attack and internal outbreaks. But they would still retain a sufficient number of paid soldiers to act in cases of emergency. They further propose to reduce the naval strength of all countries simultaneously by an international agreement. In any case the Socialists would not, reduce the armaments of their different countries below safety point.

Sec. (M) Socialism and theTrade Unions.

The relation of Socialism to the Trade Unions has more of a historical than a practical interest. In the early stages of the inception of Scientific Socialism, the Marxists were orthodox believers in the "Theory of Increasing Misery" and they were therefore opposed to all activities on the part of the employers or the labourers themselves to ameliorate the condition of the latter. Their opposition to the Trade Unions was therefore instinctive and natural. But they have changed their views since then, and have now come to realise that the Trade Unions perform great service to the labourers by bettering their present condition and teaching them to organise themselves for their future struggle with the Bourgeosie. The Socialists hold, however that with the abolition of the present system, the need for the Trade Unions would automatically disappear and thev would cease to be the "watch-dogs against the encroachments of Capitalism", but would become the "associations through which labour will function in the administration of the new industrial state".

Sec. (N) Socialism and Co-operation.

The relation of Socialism to the Co-operative

movement is not much difficult to understand. The movement was inaugerated to protect the interests of the consumers against Capitalist exploitation. But it was soon realised by its advocates that their object could not be fully attained without regulating production at the same time. The movement was not, however, meant to supplant but merely to work within the present industrial system. The Socialists therefore call upon the Co-operators to unite with them to change the present order and not remain content with merely "healing its wounds". They further declare that when Socialism is established, the movement would not wholly die away, but would work even as it does at present to deal with "the particular needs of the individual consumers," specially in the matter of goods imported from foreign countries.

Sec. (O) Socialism and the Economic Incentive to Work.

It is generally believed that Socialism would deprive men of the most effective incentive to work—the economic one—, which exists to such a large extent at present and which is the cause of the great abundance of wealth which has taken place under the present system of Capitalist industry. But the Socialists, on the contrary,

assert that the economic incentive is the most powerful of all incentives to work, and are consequently most anxious to preserve it as far as possible, consistently with the whole social interests. It is for this very reason that they do not want to abolish private property altogether, but only in those goods which involve exploitation of others' labour, nor also inheritance. They do not for the same reason, agree with the proposal of the Co munists to distribute wealth according to needs but propose to do so according to services rendered. It is therefore wrong to assert that Socialism would wholly destroy the economic incentive to work and would reduce the production of wealth to a very low amount.

It must be observed, however that the socialization of land and capital would certainly reduce the said incentive to some extent. We have therefore proposed elsewhere to leave these agents of production in private hands, and to tax them as far as possible. But if it is still felt that there are greater advantages in socialising them than in leaving them in private hands, the fear of reducing their productivity should not deter us from so doing. And the question whether it would be more advantageous to do so or not is essentially

one of practical politics and must be decided upon after a full study of actual conditions in each country.

CHAPTER XIII

The Rights.

(a) The Right to the Whole Produce of Labour.

The above doctrine is based upon the postulate that what is produced by the labour of any individual should belong to him. It is in a way the direct outcome of the Labour Theory of Value, which regards all wealth as created by labour, and from which the conclusion is drawn that all of it should belong to the labourers.

The Utopian Socialists hardly recognised the Right. Saint-Simon counted among the specially useful members of society the most distinguished entrepreneurs in the field of industry, commerce and finance, and would fain have given them a proper share of the whole produce. Fourier divided the whole produce. in the proportion of $\frac{4}{12}$ to capital, $\frac{5}{12}$ to labour, and $\frac{3}{12}$ to talent, from which the conclusion may be drawn that he was far from intending to abolish all unearned incomes. On the other hand he had declared the necessity of a considerable inequa-

lity of fortune to his proposed organization of society.

The case was, however, different with the English economists of the same period. Godwin, Charles Hall and the Irishman Thompson were specially enamoured of it. "Labour" wrote the last mentioned one, "produces all value in exchange, and therefore all its product should belong to it. But today Labour gets only the minimum, and the rest goes to land and capital" He therefore opined that there should be a reconstruction of social institutions. But he did not go to the logical conclusion of his ideas, for he would not abolish property rights, nor take the "whole produce of labour" from the capitalists and the landlords.

Proudhon was deadly opposed to any share of the produce going to the landlord or the capitalist. "Property," said he, "was robbery; property owners thieves." Rodbertus was also a staunch advocate of the Right and proposed the replacement of our metallic money by a currency of labour-hours, every workman who co-operates in the production of a commodity, receiving as many hours of its value as an average workman would require for his share of the work.

About Marx we must note that though he believed in the labour-theory of value as firmly as any previous writer, he did not advocate the "Right," for he "never based his communistic demands on the moral application of his theory of value, but only on its economic results."

In quite recent times, Karl Menger has tried to study the question from an impartial point of view and has come to the conclusion that the "Right" is "simply incompatable with our present society, which recognises private property in land and capital."

THE CRITICISM OF THE RIGHT:- In criticism of the "Right," we may note that as it is based directly on the Labour Theory of Value, it is subject to all the defects of the latter (for which, see Chap. V sec (d)). Where, as is generally the case in the present capitalist system, a particular commodity is the result of the contemporary or successive co-operation of two or more different agents of production, it cannot with truth be maintained that only one of those agents exclusive of all the others had a "right" to the "whole produce." The only way of measuring the contribution of each factor, which has yet been devised, is that of marginal productivity, and labour being at

present paid—as it would presumably be paid under Socialism also—according to it, it may safely be asserted that labour is at present getting its "whole produce." The only thing therefore which the advocates of the "Right" can do is to see that labour *is* paid according to marginal productivity and is not deprived of its "whole produce" by any cunningness on the part of the employer, or through any other advantage being taken of the former by the latter, *i. e.* all forms of economic exploitation is put an end to. If this is done, Labour will get "all that Labour produces" without depriving "capital" and "land" of their *due share* of the "whole produce."

It should not however, be concluded from the above that the capitalists and the landlords have any *right* to the incomes which they are at present receiving *It is the factors of land and capital that are entitled to a share, not the landlords or the capitalists themselves.* The Socialists therefore, while they may not justly hold labour alone as productive or as having an exclusive right to the "whole produce", may still maintain without being inconsistent that the share of the whole produce due to the factors of land and capital,

should not be appropriated by private individuals, as is the case at present, but should go to the state. We may conclude therefore by saying that the "Right to the Whole Produce" as it is advocated at present is an utterly untenable proposition and can have no justification apart from the advocacy of the communal ownership of land and capital.

(B) The Right to Work or Labour.

The "right to work" is thus stated by Mr. William Morris in his "Lectures on Socialism":—"Every man who is willing to work has a right to such employment as would earn for him all due necessaries of body and mind." Some writers have even called it the "right to live."

The right was first advocated by Fourier, was developed still by Considerant, and received support from Locke, Montesquieu and Rousseau, who were by no means socialistic in their tendencies. Proudhon had declared, "Give me the right to work and I will give you the right to property," and Louis Blanc took special pains to hit upon any scheme by which the right could actually be put into practice. As a result of the latter's proposal, the National Workshops were established in France after the Revolutions

of 1848, which, as Kirkup tells us, "were simply a traversity of the proposals of Louis Blanc established expressly to discredit them." Instead of employing skilled workers at productive works, they were filled with a mob of incompetents, who could not find employment anywhere else and were given unproductive labour. "The trick did its work," writes Mr. J.R. Macdonald, "and the Socialists had to bow before popular ignorance and become silent on the 'right to work' for a very long time." A similiar fate befell it in Germany. It was recognised by Bismark only to "take the winds out of the sails of the Socialists." "To sum up my position," he declared in the German Imperial Parliament, "give the labourer the 'right to work' as long as he is in health, ensure him care as long as he is in health, and ensure him provision when he is old. If the state did these things, the following of the Socialists would greatly diminish, as soon as the labourers see that the Government, and the legislature are earnest in their care for his well-being." The "right" was consequently embodied in the Prussian Civil Code, but amounted in practice to only a constitutional provision for poor-law relief. It was because of this that the "right" has not only disappeared from the demands of the

German Social Democrats, but has actually been opposed by them at International Congresses.

The "right to work" has, however, been given a new importance of late by the British Labour Party having adopted it as a part of its program. One of the first tasks of the Labour Government in England has been to try to realise the "right" in practice, and some of the keenest intellects in the Party are busy devising some suitable solution of the problem.

In order to understand the "right" properly, we must note that the "right to labour" is not the same thing as the "right to relief," even when it is given in the form of work, for as the Socialists declare, it is "neither founded on liberality on the part of the state, nor implies indigence on the part of the claimant," so that "it must not assume the humiliating form of poor relief." Nor does it mean the "right to search for labour," with more or less chance of success, or as Turgot talked of the right not being restricted by the Guild System. The "right to labour" thus means *not the right to seek work, but to find it.* "It means", writes Karl Menger in his famous 'Right to the Whole Produce of Labour', "that every man who can work, but does

not find one with a private employer, may claim that the state or the local authorities shall provide him with common day labour at the customary wage". The "right to labour," adds he, thus differs from the "right to the whole produce" in this that whereas in the case of the latter the worker can claim the "whole produce," in the case of the former he can only claim a "wage", while the instruments of production are merely lent him to use on behalf of the state. It does not involve the "right to capital," but on the contrary, it actually assumes the existence of private ownership of land and capital.

It also differs from the "right to subsistence" in that whereas the latter is an immediate claim on the state or the local authorities from whom the claimant may demand in return for his work the direct satisfaction of his necessities, the former can be enforced only when it is proved that the labourer has failed to find work under a private employer. Moreover the "right to subsistence" extends to the minors and the infirm, while the "right to labour" applies only to able-bodied men.

As to the methods by which the "right" can

be put into practice, as we have already observed, no satisfactory solution seems to have been arrived at yet. Mr. J.R. Macdonald lays down two possible alternatives. Firstly, that the unemployed ones receive grants during the period of unemployment from the state; secondly, that it may be provided for by a scheme of insurance, the premiums of which are paid by "the state, the trade and the body of workmen." "The first", says he, "is *not* Socialism and the Socialists would not adopt that proposal". "The second", he continues "is much nearer to the general principles of Socialism and *that is the form in which the Socialist parties of the world advocate it*".

Karl Menger was, however, opposed to the recognition of the right, for said he, "if it were recognised, the economic activities of the state would reach such huge dimensions that our actual social system can never exist by its side," and that it could only be possible by a complete transformation of the present order, and making it Socialistic." John Stuart Mill was also opposed to it on similiar grounds. "If work, with wages," wrote he, "were assured to all who asked for them, a great premium would be put on population, and such an ever-increasing throng of claimants

would appear that profitable work could not be found for all. The wages will be such as will be sufficient for the minimum of subsistence and all those who are at present paid below the minimum will have to be provided. Such provision can only be made by taxation of the wealthy. Ultimately we reach a stage of universal poverty. Starvation would reduce the population again to its normal level. Meanwhile all the civilization and culture of mankind would have been sacrificed for the sorry result of a large population whose sole care is to have sufficient food."

We may close this long review with the remark that the Right is not so difficult of being put into practice as it is thought to be, and that even if society as a whole is put to some inconvenience by the properexercise of the right, it would thereby be only relieving itself of a greater evil,—*i. e.* the existance of a permanently unemployed class,—and it should not therefore grudge the price it is required to pay for warding off the said evil. The demand of the workers seems also to be a legitimate one, and certainly some way *ought* to be found out to fulfit it. The proposal for insurance, as made above by Mr. Macdonald, seems to be a sound one and deserves special attention.

(C) The Right to Subsistence.

The "Right to Subsistence" as it is generally understood, is not recognised by any responsible Socialist group at present. The Socialists declare that an individual has no *"right"* to subsistence, apart from what be can receive as a reward for his labour, and that, therefore, if the Right is recognised, it would mean not Socialism, but rather Communism, and would expose society to all the perils to which Communism is liable. Such a principle, they declare, is hardly in a practicable in a large nation or a community, and can only be carried out small association of men united together by the closest ties of mutual inclination, such as the family.

But it must be added that the above remarks hold good only in the case of the able-bodied ones, and of those who are capable of earning a livelihood for themselves, but not for those who cannot do so, *i.e.* in the case of children, old men and women, the infirm and men of unsound mind. Such men are provided for to a more or less extent even at present and would certainly be so provided under Socialism.

CHAPTER XIV

The Revisionists.

It was in 1898 that a sharp controversy took place at the Congress of the German Social Democracy on certain important questions of theory at the instance of Eduard Bernstein. His main contention was that some of the chief theories of Karl Mark were wrongly worded, while some others have been found to be wrong by practical experience, and that, therefore, they ought to be revised in good time and be made more consistent with actual facts.

The above proposal of Bernstein was opposed by Karl Kautsky, the most uncompromising of the Marxists, and the result was that it was dropped. The very next year Bernstein published a book which when translated into English was termed "Evolutionary Socialism," and which caused a sensation throughout Germany and the rest of Europe immediately on publication. In that book, he criticised the theories of Karl Marx and advocated a revision of them. The following were some of his most important criticisms against the Marxian analysis of Capitalism:—

1. *Marx's conception of the fall of capitalism and the advent of Socialism as an inevitable category, and not as a product of human will and action.* Bernstein criticised the almost automatic nature of the process and the coming of Socialism without any effort on the part of the people. This criticism is replied to by Messrs. Spargo and Arnor in their "Elements of Socialism" by saying that Marx did not contemplate the coming of Socialism as inevitable, but the development of conditions which would force the Proletariats to rise and throw off the yoke of a handful of capitalists." The aim of Marx was not merely the extinction of Capitalism, but the socialization of the agents of production and the latter was *not* the inevitable outcome of the former, for the "conscious minority" of the Proletariats, which was to bring about the social revolution, might instead of socializing them, appropriate them to their own use and be themselves the new capitalists. All history uptil now has the same story to tell. When men have been reduced to the depths of misery and poverty, they have combined to throw off the yoke of their tyrants, but instead of having achieved freedom by so doing, they have found that they have merely substituted new tyrants from among the ranks

of their own fellow-revolutionaries in place of the old. And history is likely to repeat itself unless men insist upon moulding things in their own way. Even when it were scientifically proved that Capitalism could not last, there was the necessity for the Proletariats to be taught to bring about "Socialism,"—"to abolish their own previous mode of appropriation, and thereby also every other mode of appropriation" *The advent of Socialism was not therefore regarded even by Marx as an inevitable category, but only as a product of human will and action.*

2. *Bernstein criticised the doctrine of the "Concentration of Capital" and questioned the proposition that "conditions would sooner or later arise which would force the Proletariats to rise and to throw off the yoke of the Bourgeoisie."* He held that there was no inherent tendency for all capitalist enterprises to become larger and larger, that there was a large and important class of industries,-of which agriculture was the most prominent,-which showed no such tendency and in which there was little of concentration.

Bernstein further observed that even if it were proved that there was a tendency to *concentration of capital*, it did not follow that

it must also lead to *a concentration of wealth*, which alone could lead to widespread misery and discontent among the proletariats and consequently to the social revolution.

3. *That there is no inherent tendency in the Capitalist system for the middle class to disappear and to sink into the Proletariat class, and that consequently, we have to deal not with two but with three different classes.* The practical result of this is that the Socialist propagandist may not safely ignore the members of the middle class and address himself exclusively to the proletariats.

4. *He criticised the theory of Increasing Misery* (See Ch. VII) and denied the statement that the condition of the labourers was going from bad to worse.

5. *He criticised the Marxian analysis of historical development*,–the so-called Materialistic Interpretation of history—and declared that it was too mechanical and attributed far too little consequence to idealistic factors which play so large a part in actual life.

Besides the above, Bernstein criticised nearly every other theory of Marx and his criticisms were made much of by the anti-Socialists, who used them as an argument against Socialism. But

inspite of all that, Bernstein was a "confirmed Socialist" and was as bitterly opposed to Capitalism as the most through-going Marxists. As we have observed earlier, one may be a Socialist without ever believing in any of the theories of Marx, and the Revisionists, as Bernstein and his followers were called, while they were bitterly opposed to most of them, were as fully convinced of the necessity of Socialism and were as ready to sacrifice themselves for the cause of the Proletariats as any orthodox believer in those theories.

CHAPTER XV.

The Fabians

"The Fabians," wrote Engels," are a band of ambitious folk, who have sufficient understanding to comprehend the inevitableness of the Social Revolution, but who cannot trust this gigantic work to the rough Proletariat alone, and, therefore, have the kindness to place themselves at the head of it. Dread of the revolution is their fundamental principle." The word "Fabian" was derived from Fabius Cunctator, and was adopted by the Fabian Society, (founded in 1883), to "emphasise the difference between them-

selves and the advocates of brute force, and the believers in a sensational historical crises." The aim of the Society, as Skelton puts it, was to "inform the Socialist movement, refurbish its intellectual equipment, and to speed the socialization of industry." The Fabians believe in the continuity of social progress,-"the inevitability of gradualness" and consequently rupidiate all revolutionary activities whether violent or non-violent. Marxian theory they hold in utter contempt, rejecting both the Materialistic Interpretation, and the Labour theory of Value. Their chief aim is to capture the machinery of the Government, central as well as the municipal, and use the legislative and the administrative powers of the state to hasten social evolution. While accepting the doctrine of the International Solidarity of the Labourers, and also that of the Socialization of the Instruments of Production, they reject the Marxian doctrine of the Class War, and that of the Dictatorship of the Proletariats as propounded by the late N. Lenin.

The Fabians declare that the world has already moved a great deal in the direction of Socialism, in the matter of the Post Office, factory legislation, and income taxation, and that our

legislators at present are Socialistic without knowing it.

The Fabians have not formed a party of their own, but have preferred to remain a "coterie permeating the existing parties, and forcing the pace by the insistent pressure from within of a resolute and purposeful minority". Their most important writers have been Beatrice and Sidney Webb, Bernard Shaw, H. G. Wells, and Annie Besant.

CHAPTER XVI.

Objections to Socialism

All sorts of vague and wholly inconsistent objections have been raised against Socialism, due to the failure of the masses to understand what it is and what it aims at. The confusion, (as we have observed in chapter V) was due to the Marxian thesis explaining how the fall of Capitalism was inevitable, and how it would automatically be followed by Socialism, which led the term to be applied to *anything* that would come after the fall of Capitalism. "Socialism" thus came to be identified with Non-capitalism,

and consequently became wholly "non-descript." Any and everything that was *not* Capitalism, was "Socialism," and the latter thus became a term of negation, a term which could not be defined, which had no fixed meaning, and against which therefore any and every sort of objections could be raised! We refuse, therefore, to waste time over giving the details of the objections to Socialism in that wider sense simply because it would be useless to do so.

The term need not be used, however, in that wider sense in which it is made co-extensive with "Non-Capitalism." The latter term explains the idea sufficiently well. Of the three *Social Systems*, which we have described in the begining of this book, Communism and Anarchism having seperate names for themselves we propose to confine the term Socialism to that philosophy of Individualism which rebels against the principle of extreme Laissez Faire such as was in vogue in the more advanced countries of the world only a few decades back and which gave *full liberty* to individuals even in cases where it was inconsistent with the social interests "Socialism" goes out to challange all this, and proposes to *gaurd* the social interests against that individual liberty.

There can thus be *no* objection *on principle* to Socialism as we have defined it. There might, however, be serious objections to the *details* i.e. to the *practical proposals* of the Socialists, and if there be any such, the critics of Socialism are welcome to state them freely and discuss them on their merits. Socialism as a philosophy would stand uncondemned even if *all* the proposals of the Socialists are wrong.

Lastly, Socialism has been sometimes further restricted in meaning, and made indentical with Collectivism, and objections raised against it, as against Collectivism. We refuse to identify Socialism with Collectivism and to use two terms to denote the same thing, where only one would suffice. The objections to Collectivism are many. It is an attempt on the part of the Communists to decieve the Individualists by telling them that Collectivism would only Socialise production and would give full freedom of consumption to Individuals and is thus not opposed to Individualism at all. It may be doubted, however, if freedom of consumption can exist side by side with the Socialisation of all production and whether Collectivism would not consequently degenerate sooner or

later into Communism. If therefore Socialism be the same as Collectivism, it is open to all the objections to which Communism is open. We refuse, however, to identify Socialism with Collectivism , and do not therefore think that a condemnation of Collectivism is also one of Socialism which is truely speaking a "philosophy" and a tendency, and not merely a set of practical proposals.

CHAPTER .XVII

Influence of Socialism.

There is no doubt that Socialism has exercised great influence upon the thought of the world for the last one century, and is destined to become its chief driving force in the near future.

It has firstly exalted the claims of the community above those of the individual, and has created in the mind of its adherents the idea of self-sacrifice and public service, by calling upon even the exploiters to join the exploited ones *in putting an end to all exploitation.*

It has secondly enlarged the idea of the state and of its functions, both economic and industrial, and has created a feeling in the public mind as to its omnipotence, and its power to do anything which might be necessary for it to do in the interests of society as a whole.

Thirdly it has created the impression that poverty and misery are not wholly unavoidable things and that if proper steps are taken they can at least be considerably reduced if not altogether abolished.

Fourthly it has emphasised the influence of environment upon character and has, consequently, strongly protested against the herding together of men in large factories, where it becomes almost impossible for them to maintain their character, health or even virtue.

Fifthly it has, by declaring that men are the victims of the *system* under which they live, created the idea that the state should try to relieve as far as possible the evils and the injustices they are made to suffer for no fault of their own.

Sixthly, it hasbeen to a certain extent favourable to the diffusi on of the internatinal or cosmopolitan feelings. It has by preaching the doctrine of the International Solidarity of the Labourers

helped them in some measure towards a true appreciation of the brotherhood of mankind.

And last but not least, Socialism has gone a long way to raise the general standard of mankind, by protesting against an economic system which increases our stock of material goods, but at the same time lowers our general moral standard. It has stood for treating men as a men not merely as human machines, and has thus been the direct cause of some of the most humanitarian laws passed by the Capitalist countries of the world to-day.

It would be a pity, therefore, if such a movement were to die out or be led into evil channels by the blind zeal of the Socialists themselves or on account of the fanaticism of its opponents, and the task of restraining them both lies on the devoted heads of all true well-wishers of humanity.

PART II.

Bolshevism & Syndicalism.

"Bolshevism is a revolt against civilization and democracy."—Mr. L. STODDARD.

"There are undeniably some young fools ignorant of history and politics, and without the common human sympathies, who desire chaos"—Mr. C. D BURNS.

"Government by a minority is either anarchy or despotism."—ABRAHAM LINCOLN.

"Syndicalism is the most terrible social phenomenon that the world has ever seen. In Syndicalism we have for the first time in human history a full fledged philosophy of the Under-Man."—Mr. L. STODDARD.

"Syndicalism is largely a revolt against Socialism."—Mr. J. R. MACDONALD.

Bolshevism.

CHAPTER XVIII.

The Political Emancipation of Russia.

Before the Great War, Russia was considered to be the most backward and the least progressive country in the whole of Europe. It was under the autocratic rule of the Tsars and there was not even the least semblance of a representative government in the country There was consequently a wide-spread discontent among the politically minded classes, and the greater the attempt of the Tsars to consolidate their position in Russia, the greater and the more vehement became the opposition of the politicals towards the government. We will briefly review the history of the country from the year 1855 when Alexander II became the Tsar of Russia, to the end of the Bolshevik revolution. Alexander began as a progressive ruler of his people and introduced many benevolent reforms in the administration of the country. He liberated the serfs, created new law courts, reformed the administra-

tion generally, and introduced measures promoting the education of the masses. The effect of these progressive measures was naturally a general awakening of the country and a desire on the part of the intellectuals to introduce democratic institutions in Russia. This was far from what the Tsar had desired or had anticipated and he, therefore, hastened in good time to retrace his steps. At about the same time, in 1863, Poland tried to throw off the yoke of the Tsar and as the intellectuals of Russia were naturally sympathetic towards it, the Russian Government had to resort to repressive measures. In 1886, an attempt was made by some private individual on the life of the Tsar, which though unsuccessful, greatly exxasperated him, and virtually made him an enemy of his own people. There was, simultaneously, an increase of revolutionary and anarchistic tendencies in the minds of the people also, and the two therefore soon came to a clash. "Nihilism" as the new doctrine of destruction and pillage was called, became the fashion of the day and the followers of Bakunin and Prince Kropotkin—the two of the most intellectual leaders of Anarchism—could be counted by millions in Russia. But Anarchism could not last for long or achieve anything substantial in

the country because of the strength of the Tsar's Government, and secondly because its leader Bakunin had meanwhile suffered an intellectual defeat at the hands of Karl Marx in the First International. The intellectuals of Russia, therefore, practically gave up their revolutionary ideas for the time being and resolved to "educate" the masses. They then left their homes and scattered themselves throughout the length and breadth of the country to live with the people and teach them something of the outside world not excluding some of their own revolutionary ideas. They however found it hard to get into real touch with the peasants and the workmen, and the movement, therefore, failed to have any substantial effect, except that of creating a band of young and enthusiastic workers who were determined to even lay down their lives for the cause of their suffering compatriots

In 1880, the climax of the Nihilist agitation was reached, naturally followed by the most cruel measures on the part of the Tsar to maintain his power. He was, however, assasinated along with his queen, by one of the revolutionaries and was succeeded by his son Alexander III. The new Tsar was not a bit more satisfactory than

his predecessor and was consequently deposed in 1894, his place being taken by Nicolas III, the last of the Tsars.

In 1896, a big strike of the labourers of St. Petersburg was organised, by some young enthusiasts who had imbued Marxian ideas imported from abroad. This was followed by a general diffusion of the teachings of Karl Marx throughout the whole of Russia.

In August 1905, the Tsar introduced some measure of constitutional reforms in the country and promised to erect a representative assembly of the people, which was to be called the Duma, and without whose sanction, he promised not to carry out any law into practice. But the greater mass of the labourers and the agriculturists were not represented on it adequately and they were, therefore, not at all satisfied with the new reforms. Then followed the general strike of 1905, accompanied by numerous agrarian riots which were all put down with an iron hand.

In 1906, the first sitting of the Duma took place, but the Socialists kept themselves aloof from it. The very next year, however, when the new elections took place, they stood for it, and strange as it may seem, 132 out of 524

of the members of the assembly were Socialists. This was far from what the Government could tolerate, and it therefore set upon devising schemes to prevent the Socialists from entering the Duma, and arbitrarily enacted laws to that effect. The Socialists naturally resented this show of autocratic power, but the Tsar was determined to root out the "Evïl of Proletarian Politics" from his own realms and consequently met the opposition of the Socialists with persecutions, imprisonments, exiles, and deaths.

It is unnecessary for our purpose to go into all the details of the cruelties and the enormities that were committed by the Tsar's Government on those who wanted some form of popular control in the affairs of the state. The Tsar's "evil genius" had turned him into a veritable enemy of his own people and had made him believe that the latter existed for him, rather than he for them. This reign of tyranny continued till the year 1914, when the Great War broke out, for the inaugeration of which the Tsar was not a little responsible—it was as if he was doing so to hasten his own destruction—and which at last gave the afflicted people of Russia their long withheld freedom. It was three years after the War had begun that on a fair morning—it was

perhaps, the 8th of March 1917-the grand city of Petrograd found itself devoid of all means of livelihood and the majority of its citizens could not get even a single morsel of bread to satisfy their hunger. The labourers of the city consequently went on a general strike and refused to work unless they were supplied with rations.

The Government of the Tsar did nothing to satisfy the above-mentioned want and when the citizens and the labourers went out of their homes and flocked together, in the streets, they were asked by the police to disperse and on their refusal to do, were severely handled. One of their number was killed by a bullet shot by the police and this was a signal for a general insurrection.

The Duma sent word to the Tsar, who was on the frontier, that the populace had gone out of control and some arrangements for the supply of food must be made if the situation was to be saved. But the "benevolent monarch of his people," instead of doing anything of the sort sent the military to quell the rebellion, and dissolved the Duma.

The latter however, was determined to befriend the people and refused to comply with the wishes of the Tsar. Its leader, M. Radzinko,

issued a manifesto declaring that the time for the liberation of the country had arrived and that the Duma had decided to take over the reins of the government in its own hands. The proposal received the general assent of the people not only of Petrograd but of the rest of Russia as well, and the whole country was now with it. Strange as it may seem, the military sent by the Tsar to suppress the rebellion, refused to kill its own countrymen, and went over to their side. The Tsar meanwhile hastened to the scine of action, but was shocked to know that the situation had gone completely out of his hands. He was even in danger of losing his life and when some of the representatives of the Duma met him and stipulated with him for the safety of his life in return for his agreeing to abdicate the throne, he readily consented to do so, provided his brother, the Grand Duke Micheal was made the new Tsar. The Duma agreed to the proposal, but the "Russian Workingmen and Soldiers" Council," an influential Socialist body which was becoming more and more powerful day by day, insisted upon doing away with Tsardom altogether and establishing a republic. The council carried with it the sympathy of the majorityof the people in this respect and the

Grand Duke was also consequently done away and with, a provisional Government formed under the headship of Kerensky, a leading Socialist of Russia and an erstwhile member of the Duma. The new Government expressed its desire to work according to the wishes of the people in all important matters, to give universal sufferage, and to give all individuals the greatest possible liberty of thought and action consistent with the interests of society as a whole. It further promised to establish a republic in Russia as soon as the war came to an end, and to continue the war till an honourable understanding could be arrived at with the enemy. In this last point, however, it was opposed by the Workingmen and soldiers' council, which had by this time acquired additional strength by, the arrival of Lenin from Switzerland after a long exile, and by having made him its leader. The Council wanted peace "on any terms", and it therefore carried on an active propaganda among the peasants and the soldiers against continuing the War. The Provisional Government naturally tried to restrain it from so doing, and a Civil War consequently broke out between the two, with the result that Kerensky found himself unable

to withstand the opposition of the Council and had therefore to fly off to England to save his life. The Council was therefore left in the undisputed mastery of Russia and the task of reorganization and the administration of the country naturally fell to its leader N. Lenin and his deputy M. Trotsky. The new Government came to be termed the Bolshevik or the Saviet, and it is with the activities of this that we are chiefly concerned in this part of the book. We donot propose however, to go here into the political controversies regarding the activities of Lenin and his fellow-Bolsheviks, but would only examine them in their economic aspect. But before we do so, we must first review in short the life and the work of the man who was of all others the most instrumental in bringing about the great Social Revolution in Russia.

CHAPTER XIX.

Lenin and his Philosophy.

The late N. Lenin, the leader of the Bolsheviks, was born in 1870 of a very rich and respectable family of Russia, and was educated at one of the Russian Universities. While yet a stu-

dent, he had shown strong inclination for Socialistic ideas, and was soon after imprisoned and sent off to Siberia, for his taking part in some revolutionary activities. One of his own brothers had already been sentenced to death for a similiar offence, and it was another reason why the Government of the Tsar looked upon young Lenin with suspicion.

He managed, however, to fly off from Siberia and escape to Switzerland, where he lived till 1917, when on receiving the news of the fall of the Tsar's government, he hastened to Russia, and was hailed by the Russian Peasants' and Soldiers' Council as it leader and made the Dictator of Russia, after the fall of the Kerensky Government.

Lenin was a great admirer and a keen student of Karl Marx and his works. He himself had written many important books on economic subjects, the chief of which was his "The State and the Revolution", in which he had sketched out his own views on economics and politics. In strict theory he claimed himself to be a throughgoing Marxist, but always confining himself to the Communist Manifesto as the chief source of his inspiration. He moreover put his own in-

terpretations upon the works of Karl Marx and carried the latter's ideas as expounded in the Manifesto to their logical conclusions. Not being content, like Marx with merely showing how "conditions would develop which would render the fall of Capitalism inevitable," he tried to go a step further and sketch out the different stages of the Social Revolution. He maintained that it was to be brought about by a *violent and bloody revolution*, and that therefore those who like the British Labour Party believed in bringing it about by constitutional means were wholly wrong and would be seriously disillusioned sooner or later. Confiscation rather than compensation was consequently to be the method of "expropriating the expropriators." We may note here, however, that no other course seems to be possible if the new system which is to be established is Communism, for the latter denies *all rights of private property* and therefore compensation of any kind is out of question under it.

Secondly that the great mass of the illiterate and the ignorant Proletariats could not be expected to carry through the Social Revolution successfully and that therefore a "class-conscious" minority of the "Proletariats was to be organised,

which was to take the lead and to be "picneers' of the Social Revolution. This minority was, according to Lenin to seize in the very first place the political machinery of the state and to administer it in the interests of the Proletariats, until the Bourgeoisie were all deprived of their special privileges through the physical force of the Proletarian State—technically termed the "Dictatorship of the Proletariats"-and are for ever merged into the labouring class. There will thus be no more class-distinctions or "contradictions'' and the state itself "which exists only to moderate the acuteness of those contradictions" would become superfluous and would automatically "die out." The Dictatorship of the Proletariats would also have consequently come to an end and the erstwhile dictators not having any more classes to abolish would "retire to the hills,"

The admirers of Lenin have made much of his so-called "Theory of the Conscious Minority," and have claimed it as Lenin's contribution to Marxian theory. But they forget that as early as 1882, one Stapnyak had published a treatise on the politics of Russia of his day, and had shown therein how the agitation of his day was being carried on by only a part -"a consious minority"- of the people, while the rest of them could not

even understand their own interests. We cannot therefore give the credit of originality to Lenin in this respect.

Nor does the theory of which Lenin has so wrongly been termed the author carry the world any further than it was before. There have always existed men who have inspite of their being in a minority tried to capture the machinery of Government to themselves, irrespective of whether the majority of the people like them to be there or not. Our new Saviours also propose to do the same, with this difference, however, that whereas the former restricted themselves merely to things political, the latter would pry into our homes, would change our whole social, economic and religious systems and would instead impose one of their own, in which they believe like fanatics and which goes under the high sounding name of Communism.

We propose to devote the next two chapters to the statement and the examination of the theory of Communism, which the Bolsheviks were out to impose upon Russia, and which has plunged it into a greater serfdom than was ever experienced by it under the suzerainty of the Czars. As fate would have it, Russia became politically

free only to fall into a greater and far more severe economic slavery of Communism.

Chapter XX.

The Theory of Communism.

Communism may be defined as an economic and social system in which all rights of private property would be abolished, and where production would be carried on solely for the good of the state—and consequently controlled and regulated by it—and all consumption determined by the same. It would thus socialise not only the instrumental goods (land and capital) but also all *consumption goods* and the *labour of men.*

We must note, however, that Communism is not the same thing as Co-operation which is at present becoming so popular all the world over, or as Associationism which was the favourite theme of the Fourierists and the Owenites The distinguishing trait of both the latter is "*Voluntariness*". The Individualist system as is in vogue at present has wrongly been described as one based upon competition, whereas really speaking, it is based not upon competition, but

upon Laissez Faire—"let things alone". Now "leaving things alone," does not mean competing more than it does Co-operating. It only means that men are free to compete or to co-operate according as they find the one or the other to be the more beneficial to their interests Co-operation or Associationism is not therefore at all inconsistent with Individualism. As a matter of fact, the Co-operative movement is spreading even while Individualism is becoming more and more strong. The distinctive feature of Communism, however, is not "Co-operation," but "*Compulsion to Co-operate*," which is an undesirable thing in itself.

Communism is really speaking the direct antithesis of Individualism. It therefore claims to abolish all the evils of the latter at one stroke. It would abolish all rights of private property, and would, consequently, do away with all sorts of exchanges and the mediums thereof,——with barter, money, bills of exchange, banks, merchants brokers, and agents, travelling or otherwise. It would more over do away with all thieves, robbers swindlers or pick-pockets; there would be no cheats or "breachers" of trust, no need for policemen or "watches" at night, no job for lawyers or "bars" at law. All classes having been abolished there would be no exploitors or userers, no landlords

or capitalists, no rich men to despise their poor neighbours, or poor ones to envy the former's pomp and show. Private Capitalism having been done away with, there will be no Bourgeoisie-Proletariat disputes, no trade-unions, no crises or "overproductions," no reserve armies of labourers no profits or losses, no short or long hour problems, no conciliation or arbitration boards, no strikes or lockouts, no sabotages or general strikes, no monopolies, cartels or trusts, no wars impelled by capitalist greed, no peace that would be utilised to prepare for other wars. All labour being made the property of the state, there wonld be no fear of unemployment; distribution being according to wants, there will be no need to economise, or to otherwise suppress them, no fear of starvation, no exclusion from luxuries which are not meant for all, no provisioning for a rainy day. Idlers would not be tolerated in a world of busy men and there would thus be no surfeit of poets, philosphers or spiritual men. Marriage would be a civil relationship, women would not be allowed to consume without producing and they would thus be required to work according to the directions of the state They being also the producers of the labour-power of society, the human bulls, would be

required to breed in Government farms, and the best mates selected for them by the state, the children being the property of the state and brought up under its direction and control—such is in short the millenuim presented to us by our Bolshevik friends which we may either accept or no, till we have the power to keep them off by physical force, but which we *must* accept when we have it no more, or when they can create a band of "enthusiastic workers" from within our own ranks, who would take it upon themselves to oblige us by becoming our Dictators and forcing it down our throats ! Is it any wonder then that we daily pray to God to save us from such obliging friends?

CHAPTER XXI.

The Theory Criticised.

We propose to devote the present chapter to a thorough examination of the theory of Communism, as propounded in the previous chapter. It would be observed in the very first place that Communism, whatever its other merits, offers us a *false diagnosis* of the evils of the present system, and gives us a *wrong pres-*

cription for the removal of those evils. It errs in identifying Capitalism (an undue concentration of wealth, or of land and industrial capital in the hands of a few individuals) with Individualism, and without taking the trouble of proving that the former was the necessary outcome of the latter, or that the evils of the one could not be remedied without abolishing the other also, it goes out to destroy not only the former, but also the latter. We for ourselves regard it as a very poor way of solving the social problem. Our own view is that while both Anarchism and Communism,—the former annhilating the society altogether, and making the individual the be-all and the end-all of all existence, the latter making the society the "supreme good" and wholly repressing the individual—have become wholly discredited on account of their extreme views, Individualism, which steers a middle course between them, and proposes to give the individual the greatest possible liberty of thought and action, consistent with the interests of society as a whole, has proved itself to be the most stable, the most flexible and the most suitable social system from the point of view of both the individual as well as the society. Anarchism and Communism have been tried in nearly all the countries of the world at some

time or the other, but they have invariably failed everywhere. Nor have their advocates succeeded in proving them to be in any way superior to Individualism either from the moral or the material point of view. No doubt Communism does often put forth the plea that co-operation is superior to competition from the moral point of view, but then it forgets, --and this we are never tired of reminding its advocates—that Individualism does no more mean competition than it does co-operation, and that giving men liberty to "act as their wishes or inclinations dictate," does not imply an exhortion to them to either compete or co-operate. They may do any of these according to their own good sense and according as they think their interests, would be served better by the one or the other, and the state can only restrain them from doing any of these in cases where it finds it necessary to do so in the interests of society. And the state *does* undoubtedly restrain them at present in innumerable ways. But *no* state—not even the most democratic ones, and much less one formed by a small band of ruffians, and calling themselves.the "Dictators" no matter whether of the Proletariats or those of the Bourgeoisie,—can have any right to enslave a whole nation and de-

prive it of all liberty under the pretension of making it more moral by *forcing it to co-operate* because it thinks all co-operation to be better than competition! We have enough of that forced co-operation even under Capitalism, which the Communists are out to declaim and destroy, in a variety of ways, and we are not consequently prepared to exchange it for a greater one. The only thing consistent with the dignity of man therefore, is to *appeal* to him to live in co-operation with others and to shun competition, and not to compel him to do so by force. Voluntary co-operation is to be found in many different ways even at present—in the institutions of the family and the castes, in the form of religious and similiar other societies—and nobody has ever grudged its existence. But our whole spirit rebels against the idea of any man or a set of them *forcing* us to live jointly with others against our will. *The flexibility of Individualism is one of its most precious attributes and the consequent rigidity of Communism its most decisive condemnation!*

Nor is the view that competition is necessarily immoral, based upon any better understanding of the principles of Individualism. Competition as it is understood at present chiefly manifests

itself in the spheres of production and exchange, and the Communists have failed to show how it is bad even in those cases All exchanges, provided they are voluntary, are presumed to increase the sum total of utility, and competition in production takes place only in so far as it is found to be more beneficial and economical than co-operation. No doubt there might be or rather, are, some forms of competition which are harmful, and some exchanges which are undesirable, but then they might be restricted by the state and are so restricted even at present, not that competition and exchange should be, wholly abolished. Men might even co-operate with base motives, and take an undue advantage of others. Even under Communism they might deceive the agents of the state, might not put forth their due share of the work, and might consume more than they have produced. It is the spirit of selfishness and meanness, therefore that is bad, not competition itself and it would not therefore do to abolish the latter merely because one has a rightful hatred towards all selfish and mean acts.

There is thus nothing mean or immoral about Individualism itself. Its basic principle has been not competition, but the doctrine of Laissez-Faire,

i.e, leave things alone. The doctrine of leaving things alone was, however, followed by some of the most advanced countries of mediæval Europe in a very orthodox manner and there being no provision, under it to make the state "restrict the liberty of individuals in cases where it was prejudicial to the interests of others or to those of the society as a whole" it necessarily resulted in a great concentration of wealth in the hands of a few individuals and the consequent social tyrannies, and it has, therefore, become a very urgent problem with all those who want to establish Individualism on a proper basis to find out the best way of doing so we have proposed to call such people as the "Socialists". The Communists, on the other hand, propose to abolish Individualism itself, because they are disgusted with Capitalism, without first proving that the former also deserves to be overthrown along with the latter. We consider this to be the greatest mistake of the Communists, and that is our only excuse for 'treating this point at such an enormous length.

Now we will examine Communism a little more closely as a possible system of social reconstruction. And the first point to noted in that

connection is that of *liberty.* Under Communism the state would be the sole proprietor of all productive as well as all consumption goods, its officials all-powerful, the rest of the people being absolutely dependent on them, dependent even for the means of existence, without having much power of resistance to tyranny, having no resources of their own, without any voice in the choice of the work that they are to do and the conditions under which they are to do it, being constantly commanded and regulated in a wholly military fashion, the questions as to what they shall eat or drink, how they shall dress, what they shall read and what amount of bread they will get, being all decided by the officials of the state—everything, in short, will be done so as to crush all individuality, to rob man of his own true self, of whatever makes him truly great and dignified. Communism proposes to treat men as machines or beasts and not as human beings that are ends in themselves and as are entitled to strive after their own highest self-realisation, unhampered by any external force, save that of gaurding the liberty of others or that found necessary in the interests of society as a whole. And none is more explicit in denouncing Communism from this point of view than the

man who is said to have been "ever vigilent in gaurding Communism from all unjust attacks". "The question is", wrote J. S. Mill, "whether there would be any asylum left for individuality of character, whether public opinion would not be a tyrannical yoke, whether the absolute dependence of each on all, and surveilance of each by all, would not grind all down into a tame uniformity of thoughts, feelings and actions." And further still, "It is yet to be ascertained whether the Communistic scheme would be consistent with that multiform development of human nature, those manifold unlikenesses, that diversity of tastes and talents, and variety of intellectual points of view, which not only form a great part of the interest of human life, but by bringing intellects into a stimulating collision and by presenting to each innumerable notions that he would not have conceived of himself, are the mainspring of mental and moral progression." Let us therefore, pause and think before we submit to such a social tyranny !

The Communists propose in the second place to take from each according to their capacity and to give to each according to their needs. Everybody under it would be compelled

to labour, with the exception of the invalids and the aged. There would consequently be the danger of men evading their due share of work, if not by becoming prematurely old, at least by pretending to be invalids, or by actually becoming invalids in the hope of living an easy life henceforth at the cost of the state. And then the promise of distributing according to wants! As if the wants of men are a fixed entity, which can be easily determined by the state, and to satisfy which the latter has an inexhaustible source of income. And then shall the state distribute according to the list of wants as drawn up by the individuals themselves or shall it itself decide as to what wants are to be satisfied and what not? Probably the latter, the former being *practically* impossible. If the latter, will not the state and its officials become huge engines of oppression by stimulating or repressing any wants they like or dislike? The state being the only printer and publisher of books and newspapers, what would become of the freedom of the press? What again of books dealing with, say, Anarchism or Individualism? Even supposing that all the wants of individuals would be satisfied in a Communist State the question arises whether this fact in itself would not be the cause of

another and greater evil. All personal responsibilities and forethought having been withdrawn, and every one having been assured of full subsistence for himself and for *any* number of children that he may produce prudential restraints on the multiplication of population would be put an end, to and it would increase enormously, which would again reduce society to the verge of starvation. J. S. Mill replies to this objection by saying under Communism "Opinion" would in the first place reprobate any augmentation of numbers which diminished the comfort or increased the toil of the mass, and that if reprobation did not suffice, "society would repress by panalties of some description, this or any other culpable self-indulgence at the expense of the community". But then what are the corresponding advantages that Communism offers us in return for all those reprobations and regulations, that we should be willing to submit to all that social slavery ? All freedom of labour being withdrawn, our wants being determined by the officials of the state and satisfied at their sufferance, we being compelled to restrict our numbers not out of any sense of duty or self-restraint, but because of the regulations of the state, and perhaps also our mates selected by it,

and our children brought up and nourished under the care of its agents—what pray, what is all this kindness for? Our Communist friends would find enough of this economic millenium in the *prisons* of nearly all the countries of the world at present and they may freely enter them, if they like, by killing a policeman, but let them not think of turning the whole world into a huge prison and making it impossible for a man who would be free even though he might have to starve thereby rather than be a slave engaging all the pleasures of the world, to find a single place to hide his shame in! The real fact is that Communism concerns itself mainly or exclusively with the organization of industry. It, therefore, manifestly forfeits all claims to be considered an adequate theory of *society*, or a fitting solution of the *social* question. It takes no account of the religious, ethical, asthetic, and the intellectual aspects of our social being. It is frankly materialistic and rests on the atheistic or agnostic view of the universe. In fact, it is the *one* system, which the poet could describe as that

"*Where wealth decreases and men decay.*"

CHAPTER XXII.

The method of the Bolsheviks and its Criticism.

The Bolsheviks, as we have seen, were out to establish Communism, to socialise all production and consumption goods and to do away with private property in all its aspects. We have also observed that they believed almost fanatically in the theories of Karl Marx from beginning to end. A belief in the theories of Labour-Value and Surplus-Value as propounded by him, naturally lead them to the conclusion that the capitalists and the landlords were "reaping where they had not sown" and were consequently veritable thieves and robbers. To deprive these men of their possessions was not, therefore, according to the Bolsheviks confiscation, but the *prevention of confiscation*. They, therefore, found it the only just course to deprive these men of their property without paying them any compensation whatsoever. Those members of the Bourgeoisie who were not prepared to be so unceremoniously expropriated, were to be killed, butchered and murdered in cold blood. And as a first step towards full-fledged Communism,

and in order to enlist the support and the sympathy of the "39 criminals and 60 fools", the leader of the Bolshevikie had to decree in the very first stage of the Social Revolution that the land should be wrenched out of the hands of the big landowners by their tenants, who should devide it among themselves, and the factories brought under the control of the workers engaged therein. Thus was the sympathy of the agriculturists and the labourers enlisted in favour of the Bolsheviks and thus were they able to sweep out at one stroke all the Bourgeoisie of Russia.

That was in short the "method" of the Bolsheviks which has put almost the whole civilised world into consternation. The theory of the "conscious minority" becoming the pioneers of the Social Revolution was a sufficiently aweful thing in itself, but this novel way of winning the "*unconscious majority*" to their own side by appealing to their basest instincts and offering them the most attractive of bates, was not a bit less remarkable. Surely Lenin was shrewd enough to know that *men are not as willing to fight with the Bourgeoisie to socialise the agents of production as they are when they are themselves allowed to "appropriate*

them to their own use". But that only shows how deep the love of private property is ingrained in the soul of man and how little prepared was the Russianpeasant at least to accept Communism. The above tactic of Lenin consequently led not to land nationalization but to the establishment of peasant proprietorship and it now seems to be almost impossible for the Bolsheviks to change the present order of things at least for a very long time to come. Our second general statement—*that "Socialism might not come, even though Capitalism may fall,"* seems also, therefore, to have come out to be true as a matter of fact.

The method of the Bolsheviks as we have described it above has been subjected to all sorts of criticisms, most of which are based upon an ignorance of the fact that *no one* method can truly serve the purpose of *all* the countries of the world. We are all apt to commit the mistake of thinking that what is true of our own country is true of all others, and that, therefore, measures found necessary for us are also so for the rest of mankind. We do not agree with the view of Karl Kautsky when he blames Lenin and his followers for being "rebels against democracy". "Rebels! Sure! But, pray where was the democracy against which

they could be said to have revolted? Where were the advocates of democracy when the Czar and his "brood of evil" were working havoc with the whole of Russia and were turning it into a veritable hell? Could not Rousseau himself have become a wild savage thursting after the blood of his tyrants had he been born in the Russia of the Czars, been flogged and insulted at every small pretext, and obliged to pass the greater part of his life as an exile in the Siberian wilds, his only crime being his patriolism and love of his countrymen? Is it any wonder then that we find Lenin and his followers taking to undesirable methods of bringing about the Social Revolution? While, therefore, we are not prepared to blame the Bolsheviks for being undemocratic and for not having followed strictly "constitutional methods" in their own country, we do not, at the same time, approve of their trying to introduce their own philosophy —which according to their own doctrine of Historic Materialism, was the *outcome of purely Russian conditions*, and therefore applicable only there —into other lands, irrespective of their political and economic conditions. The founding of the Third International by Lenin at Moscow in opposition to the Second, or

as it is sometimes ironically termed the 2½ International of the German Social Democrats, to promote world revolutions, and the subsequent efforts of the Bolsheviks to corrupt the public men and the institutions of other countries with the help of Russian "gold," were things as mischevious as they were the outcome of a wrong conception of world politics. Lenin himself had later on recognised his mistake in this respect, and had thus given expression to his ideas, in the special anniversary number of the "Moscow Pravda" translated by "The Living Age" and quoted in the "Modern Review" for April 1922. "Most real revolutionists", wrote he, "have brain storm when they begin to write the word revolution with a capital R., and when they begin to exalt revolutions to a divinity. *They lose their heads and become incapable of coolly and sanely deciding at what moment it is necessary to apply revolutionary methods and when it becomes essential to use reform methods.* (Italics ours.) Real revolutionists perish......just as soon as they fancy that the 'great, triumphant world revolution' is a final end in itself and that all problems, under all conditions, in all fields of action can and should be solved solely by revolution. *Such thoughts are stupid*, and in the heat of fighting, since the revolution is the most

intense of wars, the price paid for stupidity is defeat." After such an explicit pronouncement of the great leader, shall we then expect that the Bolsheviks would give up the *stupid* thought of solving the social problem, *under all conditions, and in all fields of action solely by revolutions.* We hope they will, and will let others live, if they themselves would live,

CHAPTER XXIII.

Bolshevism in Practice.

Uptil now we have been confining ourselves to the statement and the examination of Bolshevic theory and have taken little note of what the Bolsheviks have done in actual practice, the reason being that what really matter are the principles and the politics of a particular creed, not merely the practical things which the followers of that creed might have done. The Bolsheviks as we have observed in the previous chapter, were out to establish Communism in Russia, *which they have failed to do at least for the time being.* The *practice* of the Bolsheviks at present, therefore, has nothing to do with their theory and if there be any good things which they have done in

practice, it is so, not *because* of their theory, but *inspite* of it. We protest therefore somewhat strongly against the practice of some writers on the subject to praise the "principles", of the Bolsheviks, because the former like the practial reforms introduced by the latter. "Principles" are those which one would "like" to put into practice, "practice" that which one has actually done, and what has actually done might not be the same as that which one would have liked to do.

Secondly we may observe that our knowledge of the actual state of affairs in Russia is too meagre even after seven years have elapsed since the Bolshevik revolution, to enable us to make any definite statements about the "practice" of Bolshevism. Nor does the space at our disposal permit us to go into all sorts of unnecessary details, which do not directly bear upon our subject. We must, however, shortly describe the machinery of the Bolshevik Government, generally called the Soviet system, and the attitude of the Bolsheviks towards education, religion, art and literature.

THE SOVIET SYSTEM:—The word *Soviet* means a council of any kind. In Russia the term is

applied to the differeut councils of workers engaged in a particular factory, or working on the lands of the same village regardless of the fact that they persue different trades and grades of labour. The Bolsheviks have adopted these Soviets as the basis of their government machinery—hence the term "The Soviet system" —and have based representation thereupon Only "producers of socially useful labour, including persons engaged in domestic service," may vote, "all *persons using hired labour for the sake of profit, persons living on interest or profits, traders, clericals, members of the former reigning house of Russia, speculators, the insane and persons convicted of bribery*" being excluded from the right of vote.(Vide "Report of the Committee to collect information on Russia," presented to Parliament by command of His Majesty, 1921). The franchise has moreover been extended to all the inhabitants of the country irrespective of their sex or creed. We hâve first, the village Soviets, consisting of not less than 3 and not more than 50 members, which send their representatives to the "Volosts," consisting of members each one of whom represents ten members of a village Soviet, each of the latter sending at least one representative to the former.

Next above the "Volosts" are the "Uiezd" Soviets, which not only include the representatives of the "Volosts" but also the "representatives of all towns in the area with population not exceeding 10,000 each".

The Province Soviets composed of the representatives of the "Uiezds" together with the representatives of each town in the province, one representative being elected for every 2000 inhabitants in each town" next come in order. We may note here, by the way, that the towns of less than 10000 inhabitants are thus twice represented on the Provincial Soviets, once through the Uiezds and then again directly to the provincial councils.

Above the Provincial Soviets, we have the All-Russian Congress of Soviets, composed of representatives of the former and of those of towns having 25,000 inhabitants. The towns with 25000 population have also thus a double representation. The All-Russian council is the supreme governing body of Russia, which appoints a committee, the All-Russian Central Executive Committee, consisting of 300 members as its working committee. This again appoints a council of People's Commissaries, a sort of

cabinet which actually carries on the administration of the country and is directly responsible to the All-Russian Congress of Soviets. Lenin was the president of this council, and since his death, M. Rakovsky. This is in short the constitution of the Bolshevik state.

It would have been observed above that the representation has been arranged so as to give the town workers an enormous preponderance over the surrounding peasants. This is due to the fact that it is almost impossible for the Bolsheviks to find Communist candidates in the country, who can only be found in the cities. It is said that even then "elections have been revoked by the government in some places when Communists were not elected, and many tricks and threats used to prevent the election of any but the Communists". Things are not, therefore, really "as good as they seem".

EDUCATION:— Next to the Soviets the educational system of the Bolsheviks has most attracted the attention of the outside world. Mr. Alice Bird once described it as "one of the most marvellous and outstanding characteristics of the creative effort of revolutionary Russia," and the "Committee to collect information on

Russia" has also borne testimony in their report to the "enthusiasm and sincerity shown by the Soviet government in the cause of education," and have acknowledged the fact that "great efforts have been made to teach the illiterates to read and write, and with some success, specially in the case of soldiers serving in the Red Army."

The first thing to note in this connection is that education throughout Russia has been made both free and compulsory. Whereas there were only six Universities in the country before the revolution, there are at present some sixteen. Most of them are under the control of the local Soviets. The examination system has been practically done away with, nor is there so much insistence on every student reading a particular number of subjects, or attaining a particular standard. The number of those studying law and medicine is decreasing in comparison with that of those taking science, economics and philosophy. Technical education is also making some progress Of course, the children are supported by the state, and are treated with the "utmost humanity, and the best provisions possible in existing circumstances made for their comfort". There was however

a great scarcity of books and of efficient teachers for such a large population, in the first few years of Bolshevik rule, which is now being removed with the establishment of international relations between Russia and the outside world.

But one thing, though it was not quite unexpected, must be placed to the discredit of the Bolsheviks in this connection. Every student in the country is obliged to study the theory and the practice of Communism as a revealed dogma. All Anarchist or Individualist teaching has been scruplously shut out. The above-mentioned laxity in the matter of academic learning is also accountable to the fact that the aim of education under the Bolsheviks is not so much the turning out of scholars as of political agitators fit enough to go out into the world to teach the philosophy of the Social Revolution, and the way how to achieve it. Little attention is consequently paid to the training of the mind or to the building of the character of the children. Those who prefer liberty if not also of action, at least of thought, to every thing else may not like that sort of thing, but it is the most natural thing with the Bolsheviks who are cosmopolitan enough to sacrifice their

own rest, comfort and even liberty for the one single purpose of hastening the advent of Communism throughout the whole world.

RELIGION.— We have a somewhat more positive information about the attitude of the Bolsheviks towards religion. The Communists regarded all the priests and the missionaries as the upholders of the old order of things and had therefore, as we have already seen, debarred all the "clericals" and the "Men of the Church" from having a right of vote. One writer who has been through the country states that the churches have all been turned into theaters, and that the priests, have been obliged to work in factories. But our most authoritative writer on this subject, is Prof. Charles Sarolla, who recently visited the country and has given us a description of his impressions in the columns of "The New York Times Magzine". He writes that in the Soviet schools the Christian religion is practically excommunicated. "In the schools which I visited", he writes, "teachers were invariably careful to boast to me that all the pupils were declared atheists. No one can enter the Soviet school club unless he renounces Christianity." He further cites the case of a little

boy who had been expelled from the school because he had been caught visiting a church. Verily, the philosophy of Communism is that of "bread and butter" alone.

ART AND LITERATURE:—About the attitude of the Bolsheviks towards art and literature, we may note that the little information we possess on the subject goes to show that the Bolsheviks had given the artists and the men of letters complete freedom to carry on their work in the very first stages of the Revolution, not so much, perhaps, because of any appreciation they had for their work as on account of the fact that they had meanwhile more important things to attend to. They are, however, reported to have recently begun to regulate their activities "in so far as they are inconsistent with the diffusion of Communistic ideals." All sorts of difficulties are therefore being put in the way of the artists and the men of letters, who have *bourgeois* tendencies, and who still take delight in creating works of the ancient art. Communistic art is, on the other hand, highly patronised by the government and all sorts of facitity and encouragement given to the revolutionary artists.

CHAPTER XXIV.

The Failure of the Bolsheviks.

The Bolsheviks, as we have seen, were out to establish full-fledged Communism in Russia. In his very first speech after returning to Russia from Switzerland, Lenin had exhorted his followers to throw off "Socialism" as a "dirty linen" and to "unfurl the banner of Communism". The Bolsheviks have, however, completely failed *at least for the time being*, in their project and are making the best of the situation by retreating towards Individualism as much as is found necessary. "Society", ingeniously remarks a writer in the "Modern Review" for September 1922, "does not long for a new order quite so intensely as the social reformer. As a result the social reformer either has to climb down at least some length of the ladder of theories or society gets rid of both the ladder and the climber". The Bolsheviks were wise enough to realise the truth of the above remark and are therefore making all sorts of compromises with the inevitable. "The conscious minority" on which they relied for carrying through the Social revolution, specially when it consisted of theorists rather than warriors, could not be expected

to be successful unless they enlisted the support and the sympathy of the "unconscious majority" on their side, which, as we have already observed, they did by decreeing that the peasants who formed nearly 85 % of the population might capture the lands and distribute them among-themselves. A system of peasant proprietorship was thus established in Russia, which made the cultivators a sort of small Capitalists, who were quite opposed to all attempts on the part of theBolshevik government to make them yield their products to the state. "The peasants", wrote Mr. Olgi in November 1921, "could not be induced individually or collectively to increase the productivity of the land of which all the surplus would be taken away by the state". They consequently assembled together in a representative conference of the peasants of Russia which was held at Moscow in 1920, where they almost unanimously declared that they wanted "a fixed tax payable in kind and the right after the payment of the tax to sell the surplus". The Government had consequently to yield on the point and Lenin personally assured a deputation of the peasants early in 1921, that "there will be no attempt made to return to the system of requisition or to interfere with his right freely to dispose off his surplus".

The peasant still, therefore, continues as the sole owner of the lands subject only to the payment of a tax to the government.

Then the labourers Owing to the blockade and the consequent stoppage of all foreign trade, the industries of the country had suffered a serious set back. The Bolsheviks, nevertheless, tried to confiscate all the factories and to hand over their management to the workers. The labourers were to be paid a uniform wage rate, irrespective of the work that they were required to do. It was however, found impossible to carry on the industries of the country under these conditions. The system of "workers' control" of the said industries lamentably failed, and the Bolsheviks had to restore the experts, the managers, the engineers and the organisers of industry to their old status. They had, moreover, to pay the workers according to their productivity, and to the entrepreneurs more than the average workman, and last but not least they had to allow foreign capital to come into Russia and develop its resources.

The Bolsheviks at first tried to abolish all exchanges and the mediums thereof, and to substitute work-checks which were to be given

only to those who did some work and which were to become void after a certain length of time. This also could not be successful and they were consequently obliged to introduce silver money in the country. The Bolsheviks have thus failed to nationalise land and capital, much less consumption goods. They have, in other words, failed to establish Communism in Russia, which if they had succeeded in doing so, would have turned the country into a veritable hell. But they are a band of ingenins and enthusiastic workers who being non-plussed by their failure, have now set themselves upwhole-heartedly to the task of social reconstruction. The erstwhile Communist is for the time-being a constructive Socialist and he, therefore, deserves all our sympathy in his difficult task. The present Socialist Government of England has only done right in giving an official recognition to the Soviet government, and opening up trade relations with it. Russia seems at last to be coming back to its senses and is realising that the future of the world lies not in Communism but in a sane Individualism in which men are given the greatest possible liberty consistent with the whole social interests. But the lessons that Bolshevism had to teach would not be easily

forgotten by the world. It has taught us firstly, the dangers of autocracy, and of officialdom, and secndly the utter impossibility of keeping a whole nation in chains for ever, of stiffling all national awakening by persecutions and imprisonments, and of expecting the poor to remain for ever contented with their lot when we have reduced them to the very depths of misery and degradation and to the condition where they have really "nothing to lose but their chains"! If it has done all these things, Bolshevism has not been wholly in vain. Let the ruling classes, then, open wide their hearts, give up their special privileges to which their conscience tells them they are not morally entitled, let them show their sincerity by the poor, their extreme desire to share with them the luxuries and the pleasures of this world, and let them then challange the Communist to blow his blast as well he can, and they, instead of having to *tremble* on his doing so, would themlaugh him to scorn and would stand "undaunted and unrepressed" but let them try to introduce Czardom in this world, and shutting all avenues of peaceful progress and constitutional reforms, take to "repressions, persecutions, exiles and deaths," and they would find that their very "fates with

traitors have conspired" and that all their armaments and battalions are unable to save them from the wrath of righteous indignation and proletarian savagery !

SYNDICALISM

Chapter XXV.

The Theory of Syndicalism.

"Syndicalism", writes Mr. J. R. Macdonald "is a program of Trade Union action aiming at the ending of the present Capitalist system, and its substitution by a new Social system in which the different Trade Unions will possess, control and manage all the various industries of the country, will regulate consumption and otherwise administer the general social interests." The state as it exists at present will cease to be, as there will no longer be any class distinctions or contradictions for it to abolish or to eradicate.

The "method" of the Syndicalists is that of "Direct Action", which means all action by the workers *directly*, i. e. without the intervention of the state, and without using its parliamentary or legislative machinery. The chief forms of Direct Action that appeal to the Syndicalists are, firstly, the local strikes which "train men

in the art of working together and rouse their spirits," which "encourage insubordination" and make the Social Revolution more probable by creating disorder in the Industrial world, secondly, the sabotage, which means the doing of bad work by the labourers when in actual employment, and the spoiling of machinery or work that has already been done, as a method of dealing with the employers when a dispute has arisen, and the workers, for some reason or the other, consider the strike to be undesirable or impossible, and last but not leas the "General Strike", which is the "simultaneous stopping of work" by all the industriâl workers of a country, with a view to bring the Capitalists to their knees, to compel them to give the proletariats the right of ownership and the control of their factories, to "overturn society absolutely," and to "lead to an unknown future entirely different from the past."

Syndicalism, we must further observe, is a fusion of Anarchist, Socialist, and Trade Union ideas, all in one. It is Anarchist in its hatred of the state, and the denial of its sovereignty, in its rejection of democracy and the disavowal of the authority of law. It is Socialistic in so far as it pretends to be a Proletarian move-

ment, believing in the doctrines of the International Solidarity of the labourers, the Clasa-War and the inevitability of the Social Revolution. It is Trade Unionist in so far as it proposes to give the Trade Unions the "control and the management" of all the industries of the country. The "method" of bringing about the Social Revolution is, as we have seen, the "General Strike", which is also an attempt to find a happy mean between the slow and steady progress of Socialism along parliamentary lines and the violence and the terrorism of Anarchism and Communism.

Though Syndicalism is a movement which believes neither in justice nor in morality, it has been fortunate enough to have some great thinkers on its side, among whom must specially be mentioned the names of Berth, Lagardelle, Pouget, Antonio Labriola and last but not least Georges Sorel, who have made the movement a really formidable one by giving it a tone of learning and a scientific background and by raising into a system what would other wise have been considered mere criminal folly and rude highhandedness. Sorel, of all others, deserves more than merely a passing reference.

He claims himself like Linin, to be a strict Marxist, but like him also, confines himself to the Communist manifesto for the derivation of his ideas. But he differs from Lenin, firstly in his advocacy of the General strike—which in order to be successful must be universal and thus be more or less dependent on the will of the majority of the labourers and his rejection of the theory of the "concious minority ," which authorises a few labourers to dictate terms not only to the capitalists but also to the majority of their own class and which is consequently much less democratic than the former and secondly, in the abolition of the state altogether and its substitution by "the administration of things". The "General strike" is in fact the central idea of Syndicalism and Sorel owes his popularity chiefly because of his having devoloped its theory, more than any other of the socalled "intellectuals" of Syndicalism. "On some appointed day," wrote he, "the labourers would "simply stay at their own homes," would neither be required to give a vote nor to rise or revolt burn or kill. Their mere refusal to work would bring the Capitalist to their knees, would give the labourers the control of their factories and would put an end to the misery and the suffering

of the present system. Sorel, along with his fellow-Syndicalists, is opposed to all parliamentary methods or to "progress along constitutional lines," for as he says "political action can give us only political power", which "cannot be transmuted into economic power", and secondly because "political action touches the workman only as an elector and as a member of the political society mixed together with citizens belonging to other classes, whereas "direct action" divides him into a seperate class and considers him exclusively as a member of the economic society whose interests are quite antagonistic to those of other classes". Party and class say the Syndicalists are not one and the same thing and their tactics must therefore necessarily differ. "Class" is in their opinion a natural combination, while party is artificial and intellectual. Sorel, therefore, appeals to the workers to give up maddling in politics and to rely wholly upon their own "industrial action" for the attainment of their object.

The success of the Syndicalist schemes must ultimately result in the workers "engaged in the different industries of the country taking possession thereof, They would of course either

drive out the proprietors altogether or would keep them to their post to direct and control the business and would pay them a decen salary. They would thus have practically confiscated the property of the capitalists. They do not care to reflect, however, whether it would be fair or just to do so or not. As a matter of fact, they do not care much about the "morality" of the thing itself. The question with them, as we have seen in an earlier chapter, is not so much of "necessity plus justice" as of "necessity plus strength". Nor are they open to any proposals for conciliation, compromise, co-operation, or reform. They would not tolerate any "welfare schemes" as they are likely to weaken the enthusiasm of the workers for the "General Strike". Local strikes are to be organised wherever possible or practicable, and the sabotage, wherever practised, is to be highly respected. Such is, in short, the novel scheme of Industrial regeneration which a few young intellectuals of France have to offer to the world.

CHAPTER XXVI.

The criticism of the theory.

We have seen above that the ideal of the Syndicalists is to give the workers the control

of the different factories in which they are engaged. The labourers would not only choose their own entrepreneurs, and managers but would also determine what they shall produce, how much shall they produce, and what shall be the quality and the price of their goods. The workers in factories producing "necessary goods" would thus be in a commanding position before all others, and would thus be able to *exploit* the rest of society in its capacity as a consumer. Syndicalism would thus create new classes of its own, the struggle between whom is likely to be even a more formidable one than is the case at present.

The greatest objection to the Syndicalist ideal is, therefore, that it makes no provision for gaurding the interests of the consumer. To say that the consumer is after all the producer and that, therefore, as Mr. Cole puts it, "the workers as producers cannot practise fraud on themselves as consumers", is utterly misleading, because though *all* the producers may not be able to exploit *all* the consumers, there is nothing to prevent *some* of the most powerful producers (e. g. those engaged in, say, the railway and transport services) from exploiting *some* of the consumers, who are the producers

of articles with a very elastic demand (e. g. producers of, say, textile goods). And then even if the prices of different goods be fixed by a "national" pact" it is yet doubtful whether there will not be a great detoriation in the *quality* of the goods made. Syndicalism, therefore, *neither assures good service nor a fair price to the consumer.* Nor does it fare better from the producer's point of view. There will be a great rush of labourers in the most profitable industries and the less profitable ones would be poorly staffed. There is thus no gaurantee that under Syndicalism production will be according "*to use rather than to profit.*" The managers and the entrepreneurs being appointed by the labourers themselves, and removable by them, it is doubtful whether proper discipline can ever be maintained in the factories and whether the effeciency of work would not greatly suffer. Syndicalism does not provide therefore, a sound system for the production of wealth.

Nor have we anything better to say about the *method* of the Syndicalists. Direct action means not a union of parliamentary with non-parliamentary action, *but the latter alone.* All those therefore who believe in democracy and constitutionalism must naturally be

opposed to all forms of Direct Action. No sound reason is given by the Syndicalists against the use of parliamentary methods wherever they are found practicable and affective. "Party" and "class" may not be the same things but there is nothing to prevent a "class" from forming a strong "party" in the legislatures of the country. To say that "economic action" alone can give economic freedom is to declare that political action cannot solve economic problems—an utterly wrong presumption—and to confuse the *subject* of the controversy with the *method* of solving it. Parliaments are not meant merely to decide as to the constitutions of countries or the political relations between the King and his subjects, but might as well be used for the solution of economic, religious, and social problems. To lure the workers thus away from constitutional methods and to teach them to impose their will upon others by force is, therefore, nothing short of criminal and unpatriotic.

Direct Action is, in short, a doctrine of negation. It forgets that *two* weapons are always more effective than one. Is it not better then to adopt both of them simultaneously. Of course nobody wants the labourers to rely solely on

parliaments, for the ruling classes might have contrived them so as to keep the labourers shut off from them, but surely where they can use them at all effectively, it seems to be extremely desirable that they do so. Political Action backed up by a *threat* of taking to Direct Action if unnecesssary and objectionable obstacles ar e put in the path of the labourers, might make their power irresistable, while merely "economic" action though it might destroy the power of the Capitalists is at the same time likely to create indiscipline and insubordination among the labourers themselves, which would make it almost impossible for them to evolve a sound scheme of social reconstruction for themselves.

The scheme being thus defective from *all* points of view, is it then too much to say that it thrives merely on a criminal desire on the part of the labourers to rob the Capitalists of what they have got, and to appropriate it to their own use ? If so, Syndicalism deserves to be mercilessly eradicated from the world inspite of the large number of the so-called "intellectuals" which it has the good fortune of having on its side.

THE END.

Appendex A.

Mr. John Stuart Mill on "Inheritance"

The institution of property, when limited to its essential elements, consists in the recognition, in each person, of a right to the exclusive disposal of what he or she have produced by their own exertions, or received either by gift or by fair agreement, without force or fraud, from those who produced it. The foundation of the whole is, the right of producers to what they themselves have produced. It may be objected, therefore, to the institution as it now exists, that it recognises rights of property in individuals over things which they have not produced.

Nothing is implied in "property" but the right of each to his (or her) own faculties, to what he can produce by them, and to whatever he can get for them in a fair market: together with his right to give this to any other person if he chooses, and the right of that other to receive and enjoy it.

It follows, therefore, that although the right of bequest, or gift after death, forms part of the idea of private property, the right of inheritance,

as distinguished from bequest, does not. That the property of persons who have made no disposition of it during their lifetime, should pass first to their children, and failing them, to the nearest relations, may be a proper arrangement or not but is no consequence of the principle of private property.

The reasons usually assigned by modern writers for giving the property of a person who dies intestate, to the children, or nearest relatives, are first, the supposition that in so disposing of it, the law is more likely than in any other mode to do what the proprietor would have done, if he had done anything; and secondly, the hardship, to those who lived with their parents and partook in their opulence, of being cast down from the enjoyments of wealth into poverty and privation.

There is some force in both these arguments. The law ought, no doubt, to do for the children or dependents of an intestate, whatever it was the duty of the parent or protector to have done, so far as this can be known by any one besides himself. Since, however, the law cannot decide on individual claims, but must proceed by general rules, it is next to be considered what these rules should be.

We may first remark, that in regard to collateral relatives, it is not, unless on grounds personal to the particular individual, the duty of any one to make a pecuniary provision for them. No one now expects it, unless there happens to be no direct heirs; nor would it be expected even then, if the expectation were not created by the provisions of the law in case of intestacy I see, therefore, no reason why collateral inheritance should exist at all Mr. Bentham long ago proposed, and other high authorities have agreed in the opinion, that if there are no heirs either in the descending or in the ascending line, the property, in case of intestacy, should escheat to the state. With respect to the more remote degrees of collateral relationship, the point is, not very likely to be disputed. Few will maintain that there is any good reason why the accumulations of some childless miser should on his death (as every now and then happens) go to enrich a distant relative who never saw him, who perhaps never knew himself to be related to him until there was something to be gained by it, and who had no moral claim upon him of any kind, more than the most entire stranger. But the reason of the case applies alike to all collaterals, even in the nearest degree Collate-

rals have no real clâims, but such as may be equally strong in the case of non-relatives; and in the one case as in the other, where valid claims exist, the proper mode of paying regard to them is by bequest.

The claims of children are of a different nature: they are real, and indefeasible. But even of these, I venture to think that the measure usually taken is an erroneous one: what is due to children is in some respects underrated, in others, as it appears to me exaggerated. One of the most binding of all obligations, that of not bringing children into the world unless they can be main tained in comfort during childhood, and brought up with a likelihood of supporting themselves when of full age is both disregarded in practice and made light of in theory in a manner disgraceful to human intelligence. On the other hand when the parent possesses property, the claims of the children upon it seem to me to be the subject of an opposite error. Whatever fortune a parent may have inherited, or still more, may have acquired, I cannot admit that he owes to his children, merely because they are his children, to leave them rich, without the necessity of any exertion. I could not admit it, even if to be so left were

always, and certainly, for the good of the children themselves. But this is in the highest degree uncertain. It depends on individual character. Without supposing extreme cases, it may be affirmed that in a majority of instances the good not only of society but of the individuals would be better consulted by bequeething to them a moderate, than a large provision. This, which is a common-place of moralists ancient and modern, is felt to be true by many intelligent parents, and would be acted upon much more frequently, if they did not allow themselves to consider less what really is, than what will be thought by others to be, advantageous to the children.

The duties of parents to their children are those which are indissolubly attached to the fact of causing the existence of a human being. The parent owes to society to endeavour to make the child a good and valuable member of it, and owes to the children to provide, so far as depends on him, such education, and such appliances and means, as will enable them to start with a fair chance of achieving by their own exertions a successful life. To this every child has a claim; and I cannot admit, that as a child he has a claim to more. There is a case in which these

obligations present themselves in their true light, without any extrinsic circumstances to disguise or confuse them: it is that of an illegitimate child. To such a child it is generally felt that there is due from the parent, the amount of provision for his welfare which will enable him to make his life on the whole a desirable one. I hold that to no child, merely as such, anything more is due, than what is admitted to be due to an illegitimate child: and that no child for whom thus much has been done, has, unless on the score of previously raised expectations, any grievance, if the remainder of the parent's fortune is devoted to public uses, or to the benefit of individuals on whom in the parent's opinion it is better bestowed.

In order to give the children that fair chance of a desirable existence, to which they are entitled, it is generally necessary that they should not be brought up from childhood in habits of luxury which they will not have the means of indulging in after life. This, again, is a duty often flagrantly violated by possessors of terminable incomes, who have little property to leave. When the children of rich parents have lived, as it is natural they should do, in habits corresponding to the scale of expenditure

in which the parents indulge, it is generally the duty of the parents to make a greater provision for them, than would suffice for children otherwise brought up. I say *generally*, because even here there is another side to the question. It is a proposition quite capable of being maintained, that to a strong nature which has to make its way against narrow circumstances, to have known early some of the feelings and experiences of wealth, is an advantage both in the formation of character and in the happiness of life. But allowing that children have a just ground of complaint, who have been brought up to require luxuries which they are not afterwards likely to obtain, and that their claim, therefore, is good to a provision bearing some relation to the mode of their bringing up, this, too, is a claim which is particularly liable to be stretched further than its reasons warrant. The case is exactly that of the younger children of the nobility and landed gentry , the bulk of whose fortune passes to the eldest son. The other sons, who are usually numerous, are brought up in the same habits of luxury as the future heir, and they receive, as a younger brother's portion, generally what the reason of the case dictates, namely, enough to support, in the habits of life to which they are

accustomed, themselves, but not a wife or children. It really is no grievance to any man, that for the means of marrying and of supporting a family, he has to depend on his own exertions.

A provision, then, such as is admitted to be reasonable in the case of illegitimate children and of younger children, wherever in short the justice of the case, and the real interests of the individuals and of society, are the only thing considered, is, I conceive, all that parents owe to their children, and all, therefore, which the state owes to the children of those who die intestate. The surplus if any, I hold that it may rightfully appropriate to the general purposes of the community. I would not, however, be supposed to recommend that parents should never do more for their children than what, merely as children, they have a moral right to. In some cases it is imperative, in many laudable, and in all allowable to do much more. For this, however, the means are afforded by the liberty of bequest. It is due, not to the children but to the parents, that they should have the power of showing marks of affection, of requiting services and sacrifices, and of bestowing their wealth according to their own preferences, or thier own judgment of fitness.

———:o:———

BIBLIOGRAPHY.

R. MACDONALD:— The Socialist Movement.

" Syndicalism.

B. RUSSELL: — Roads to Feedom.

" Theory and Practice of Bolshevism.

SPARGO & ARÑOR;—Elemf Socrentsolism

J. SPARGO:— Social Democracy Explained.

SKELTON: — A Critical Analysis of Socialism.

KIRKUP:— Enquiry into Social ism.

" History of Socialism.

NICHOLSON:— Revival of Marxism.

SALTER:— Karl Marx and the Close of his System.

P. SNOWDON:— Social ism, Syndicalism.

MARX & ENGLES:—Communist Manifesto.

L. STODDARD:— Revolt against Civil ization.

K. MENGER:— Right to the Whole Produce of Labour.

H. WITHERS:— Case for Capitalism.

HANDERSON:— Case for Socialism.

MALLOCK:— A Critical Examination of Socialism.

HANEY:— History of Economic Thought.

GIDE:— History of Economic Doctrines.